

ZIONISM

**Enemy
of Peace and Social
progress**

Issue 5



PROGRESS PUBLISHERS · MOSCOW

ZIONISM - Enemy of Peace and Social Progress

Issue 5



Progress Publishers
Moscow

Translated from the Russian by *Vic Schneierson*

Miscellany compiled by *Lyonel Dadiani*

СИОНИЗМ — ПРОТИВНИК МИРА
И СОЦИАЛЬНОГО ПРОГРЕССА

Выпуск 5

На английском языке

Printed in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics

С $\frac{0801000060-441}{014(01)-88}51-88$

ISBN 5-01-000486-0

© Progress Publishers 1988

CONTENTS

<i>A. Yuriev.</i> Collapse of the State of the Jews of All the World Concept and Zionism's Ideological and Po- litical Crisis	5
<i>T. Karaseva.</i> The Latest Tendencies in Relations Between Israel and Jewish Communities Abroad	21
<i>V. Artemiev.</i> Discrimination Against Oriental Jews in Israel	40
<i>E. Dmitriev.</i> Maligners of Marxism	56
<i>L. Jacobson.</i> The Anti-Communist Essence of International Zionism	64
<i>M. Goldenberg.</i> The Zionist Variety of Anti-Sovietism . .	88
<i>L. Dadiani.</i> Zionism and the Social-Democratic Movement	117
<i>A. Andreyev.</i> The Israel-South Africa Alliance Is a Threat to the National Liberation Movement	154
<i>A. Yegoshkin.</i> The History of FRG-Israel Relations	172
<i>G. Schulmeister.</i> A Criminal Alliance	194

A. Yuriev

**COLLAPSE OF THE STATE
OF THE JEWS OF ALL
THE WORLD CONCEPT
AND ZIONISM'S
IDEOLOGICAL AND
POLITICAL CRISIS**

World Zionism is in deep crisis. The crisis is ideological, political, organisational, financial and economic. It has surfaced in Israel, where Zionism is the official ideology shaping the political practice of the ruling elements, and in the Jewish communities in the capitalist world (the Diaspora). Substantial contradictions also prevail between Zionists of different countries, especially between the Zionists of Israel and the United States, those two leading centres of world Zionism.

Despite various distinctions, the critical developments have what may be described as a common denominator: they are all rooted in the basic postulates of Zionist theory, notably that of a worldwide Jewish nation and of Israel as the state of the Jews of all the world.

More or less sizable groups of Jews have lived in various countries all down the ages, subject to strong migrational tendencies. Various theorists of Jewish nationalism see these facts not as derivatives of social, economic and political factors (which is the only correct approach to social processes, including the migration of large groups of people and the emergence and development of nations). They clothed them in an esoteric Judaic religious mysticism (suffering for the sake of redemption, banishment for the sake of reunion in Zion, and the like). Anti-Semitism, which Jews have encountered everywhere in class societies, plays an important part in the bid of Jewish nationalists to prove that Jews, wherever they may live, have a common destiny.

But the first scientific analysis of the Jewish question,

including the problem of anti-Semitism and the dispersal of Jews, was made by the founders of scientific socialism, Marx and Engels. In an early piece, "On the Jewish Question" (1843), Marx rejected the theological approach to that issue and dismissed the attempts at raising the antithesis of Jews and Christians to an absolute. He traced the reasons for "the special position of Judaism in the contemporary enslaved world"¹ to its specific history. "Judaism," he pointed out, "continues to exist not in spite of history, but owing to history."² He noted that "the Jewish question acquires a different form depending on the state in which the Jew lives."³ And he amplified: "This secular conflict, to which the Jewish question ultimately reduces itself, is the relation between the political state and its preconditions, whether these are material elements, such as private property, etc., or spiritual elements, such as culture or religion."⁴

Lenin, too, examined the Jewish question. Looking into the condition of Jewish communities at the turn of the 19th into the 20th century, during the passage of the capitalist order to its imperialist stage, he pointed out that "out of the ten and a half million Jews all over the world *about half* that number live in the *civilised* world, where conditions favouring 'assimilation' are *strongest*, whereas the unhappy, downtrodden, disfranchised Jews in Russia and Galicia, who are crushed under the heel of the purishkeviches (Russian and Polish), live where conditions for 'assimilation' *least* prevail, where there is most segregation, and even a 'Pale of Settlement', a *numerus clausus* and other charming features of the Purishkevich regime".⁵

The disparate conditions in which Jewish communities existed in various countries caused them to develop in differ-

¹ Karl Marx, "On the Jewish Question", in: Karl Marx, Frederick Engels, *Collected Works*, Vol. 3, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1975, p. 169.

² *Ibid.*, p. 171.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 160.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 154.

⁵ V. I. Lenin, "Critical Remarks on the National Question", *Collected Works*, Vol. 20, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1977, pp. 28-29.

ent ways. The prevalent tendency in the bourgeois democracies, as Lenin showed, was assimilation with the non-Jewish environment. He pointed out that "only Jewish reactionary philistines, who want to turn back the wheel of history, and make it proceed, not from the conditions prevailing in Russia and Galicia to those prevailing in Paris and New York, but in the reverse direction—only they can clamour against 'assimilation' ".¹

In view of the segregation of Jews in Russia, he wrote, and in the absence of any realistic basis for assimilation, the only hope of the oppressed Jewry, as that of all other national minorities, was "to throw off the feudal yoke, all national oppression, and all privileges enjoyed by any particular nation or language" in democratic revolutionary struggle of the working class.² "The Jewish question," he wrote, "can effectively be solved only together with the fundamental issues confronting Russia today."³

Yet from the day Zionism came into being, which was an invaluable service to reaction, it has aspired to the opposite goal: that of keeping the mass of working Jews out of the proletariat's general revolutionary struggle for a radical reorganisation of society, which also implied true equality of all nations and ethnic groups. Like all other Jewish bourgeois nationalists, the Zionists postulated isolation of Jews in public life on account of what they termed the exclusiveness of their destiny. They contributed to the ideological pillars of Jewish nationalism by linking the idea of a "specific worldwide Jewish people" with that of a "state of the Jews of all the world". This linkage they expressed in a catchy but scientifically unsound and politically provocative slogan of giving a people without a country, a country without a people. The idea of a state of the Jews of all the world (in the bourgeois nationalist sense of the term) was inherent in all the doctrinal currents of Zionism—the political Zionism of Theodor Herzl, the spiritual Zionism of Achad Haam, the revision-

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 29.

² *Ibid.*, p. 35.

³ V. I. Lenin, "The National Equality Bill", *Collected Works*, Vol. 20, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1977, p. 172.

ist Zionism of Vladimir Jabotinsky, and so on. The difference between them was one of details or of tactics in attaining the principal aims. Political Zionism, for example, put Jewish statehood at the head of the list and demanded that all Jewish communities concentrate all their endeavours on achieving it, so that subsequently the Jewish state should gather within its boundaries most of the Jews of the world. Spiritual Zionism, on the other hand, prescribed cultural autonomy for Jews in the Diaspora, while it did not rule out the existence of a Jewish state modified as to size of the Jewish population and its relative meaning for the "survival of the Jewish people".

The initiators of Zionism also maintained that the Jewish state, should it ever arise, would have the same "uniqueness and exclusiveness" as are "inherent" in the Jewish people, and that it would set an example of lofty morality and economic prosperity for all others to follow.

The history of Zionism, and above all that of the forty-odd years since the appearance of Israel on the map of the world, has dispelled all illusions on that score. The Zionist policy of Israel's rulers has been the cause of a long-drawn-out regional conflict with global consequences. They are to blame, too, for Israel's becoming a pawn in the imperialist game of the United States.

It is ridiculous to speak of any lofty mission while the Israeli military machine practices state terrorism on the international scene, while the Israeli economy, crippled by militarism, is constantly on the edge of collapse, while Israel stands disgraced before the world for the racism of the "superior" Jewish race against Palestine Arabs, and while racial intolerance invades religion and mars relations between Jews who hail from different countries, notably between Ashkenazim and Sephardim, the two main Jewish ethnic groups. In a way, indeed, the realities in Israel are graphic evidence that bourgeois society cannot resolve the national question fairly and democratically.

Behind the Zionist claims to Israel's exclusiveness under international law are mystic religious concepts. Zionist theorists have endowed the Jewish state with qualities that

go much farther than exercising sovereignty within its own territory and in respect of its own population. They have declared Israel the fruit of Jewry's dream, and have followed this up with the idea of an indissoluble link existing between the Jewish people and the Jewish state.

These concepts were worked into legislative acts which, in substance, unilaterally extended Israeli sovereignty to encompass citizens of other countries. On July 5, 1950, Knesset passed a Law of Return, and backed it with a Nationality Law on April 1, 1952, whereby Jews of any country were automatically conferred Israeli citizenship.

Nor did the Israeli leadership confine itself to simply declaring its rights with regard to Jews of other countries. It drew up a large-scale programme and, to use its own vocabulary, set about "gathering in the Jews of the entire world in the Promised Land".

The mass influx of Jews, as the Israeli leadership planned, was to be furthered by Zionists all over the world. They adapted some of the basic provisions of Zionist theory dating to before the birth of Israel (above all the notion of a worldwide Jewish people), to the aims and purposes of Israel. Given a new content, these were to be enshrined in the fundamental documents of the World Zionist Organisation and Jewish Agency (WZO/JA), so as to shift the emphasis in the activity of Zionist organisations worldwide above all on ensuring a flow of Jewish immigrants to Israel.

The Law on the Status of the WZO/JA adopted by Knesset in 1952 (which defined the functions of the WZO in Israel and Jewish communities abroad in terms suiting the Israeli Zionists), said gathering refugees was the central task of the State of Israel and the Zionist movement. The State of Israel, it said, expected all Jews, whether individuals or groups, to cooperate in building the country and furthering immigration. It added that the Zionist Organisation was expected to work for such cooperation.¹

¹ W. T. Mallison, "The Legal Problems Concerning the Juridical Status and Political Activities of the Zionist Organization/Jewish Agency: A Study in International and United States Law", *William and Mary Law Review*, Vol. 9, Spring 1968, p. 589.

In the 1950s, Zionists organised the resettlement in Israel of a large number of Jews from Iraq, Yemen, Turkey, Iran, and the North African countries of Morocco, Algeria, Tunisia, Libya, and Egypt. But Israeli hopes of rapid economic growth and a flow of money were pinned not on these Orientals, as they were called, but on Jews immigrating from the industrialised capitalist states of Europe and from the United States and Canada. Stimulating immigration from Western states was also politically and ideologically important because, as Nathaniel Weyl put it, the founders of the new state "hoped that it would attract European and American Jews in sufficient numbers so that it would remain basically a Western society".¹ Because Israel's capitalist economic pattern and adventure-some foreign policy would be best served by a society cut to the Western pattern and with a predominantly Western white population.

At that time Israeli Zionists endeavoured to prevail on the world Jewry that the Diaspora should disappear through the integration of the vast majority of Jews in the Jewish state. The call to organise mass immigration of Jews to Israel and ultimately to liquidate the Diaspora, was addressed first of all to the Jewish community in America. In the late 1940s, Israeli leaders mounted a high-powered campaign to induce American Jews to settle in Israel. The time was propitious, for at that moment Zionist and pro-Israeli sentiment ran high in the Jewish community in the USA, still worked up by the Zionist propaganda drive of the 1940s for the creation of an "independent Jewish state".

The Israelis, however, mistakenly ascribed these sentiments to an immutable loyalty to the state of the Jews of all the world, which, as they conceived it, would automatically lead to a substantial influx of immigrants from America.

The Israeli leaders ignored the fact, at least to a point, that US Zionists had played a decisive part in persuading American Jews to aid what had been called "Jewish

¹ Nathaniel Weyl, *The Jew in American Politics*, Arlington House, New Rochelle, New York, 1968, p. 296.

Palestine" during World War II. They concluded that in the US there was no difference between Zionists and non-Zionists when it came to supporting or aiding Israel. In May 1951, David Ben-Gurion visited the USA for the first time since the establishment of Israel to launch an Israel Bonds drive. Throughout his tour, notes Howard M. Sachar, an American author, "he studiously avoided all reference to Zionism, emphasizing by implication his view that only those Jews who settled in Israel were true Zionists".¹

A sharp ideological conflict erupted between the American and Israeli Zionist centres at the turn of the 1940s into the 1950s, when the idea of "liquidating" the Diaspora first appeared. To see it in the right perspective, we should remember that Zionism is not the sole current of Jewish bourgeois nationalism in the United States. To begin with, there is the distinction between Zionists and non-Zionists. The former are members of organisations affiliated with the WZO and adhering officially to the provisions of the Zionist programme and other statutory documents of the international Zionist movement.

Non-Zionists by definition include those Jewish bourgeois nationalist organisations that are not officially affiliated with the WZO, and for whom Zionist propaganda is not the basic activity. They may use Zionist slogans of aiding Israel, but only inasmuch as it favours their other activities and purposes within the American Jewish community. They and the Zionists participate differently in pro-Israeli activity.

Following World War II and the large-scale campaign for an independent Jewish state, Zionists seized the commanding heights in the political, financial and economic structures, as well as the ideological life, of the American Jewish community. But that did not mean that their domination was undivided. They were not foreign to the interests of the non-Zionist part of the community and at times came under its influence.

¹ Howard M. Sachar, *A History of Israel from the Rise of Zionism to Our Time*, Basil Blackwell, Oxford, 1976, p. 719.

On the other hand, the state of relations between American and Israeli Zionists over ideological issues is not a matter of indifference to non-Zionists. The ideological conflict between Zionists of the two countries over liquidation of the Diaspora and obligatory "ingathering" that began at the junction of the 1940s and 50s has shown that the standpoint of the non-Zionist part of the American Jewish community had been decisive for settling that controversy. Its spokesmen expressed the opinion of the majority of American Jews. No amount of raging and fuming on the part of the Zionists, and of Ben-Gurion for that matter, made a dent in their decision to stay in America. This, we learn from the *Jewish Newsletter* of September 2, 1959 as quoted by author Alfred M. Lilienthal, "was the one great act of defiance of Western Jews against Israel which doomed 'Ingathering' to ideological bankruptcy and material failure."¹

Zionists and non-Zionists in America were aware of the situation that prevailed in the community. They saw that economic, political and ideological grounds for inducing American Jews to emigrate to Israel en masse were totally lacking.²

Estimates of the number of American Jews who have resettled in Israel differ. Robert Silverberg, an American writer, studied the statistics of the late 1960s and arrived at the conclusion that determining how many American Jews actually live in Israel was not easy. "Israel," he wrote, "makes no data available on the subject. The American Embassy in Israel has estimated, unofficially, that there are about 6,000."³

¹ Alfred M. Lilienthal, *The Other Side of the Coin. An American Perspective of the Arab-Israeli Conflict*, The Devin-Adair Company, New York, 1965, pp. 32-33.

² The fact that Jews in the United States see themselves first and foremost as American citizens and that they have no wish to change their allegiance, exposes the hypocrisy of the Jewish nationalist elements in the West who adduce that Jews in socialist countries are differently disposed. This double standard has clear ideological grounds and results from anti-communist prejudices.

³ Robert Silverberg, *If I Forget Thee O Jerusalem: American Jews and the State of Israel*, William Morrow and Company, Inc., New York, 1970, p. 477.

The biggest inflows to Israel in general, and from the USA in particular, occurred during aggravations of the Arab-Israeli conflict, accompanied by frenzied Zionist "save Israel" campaigns that whipped up chauvinist pro-Israel sentiment. Still, despite zealous propaganda, Israel has not become a homeland for Jews.

British researcher Walter Laqueur writes:

"There had been a wave of enthusiasm among Jewish communities in 1947-48 but this had gradually ebbed away, and most assimilated Jews—and the process of assimilation was making constant progress in almost all western countries—followed events in the Jewish state with diminishing interest. They might perhaps visit Israel once or twice, but they certainly did not regard it as their own country".¹ (Similar waves of enthusiasm occurred in 1967, and again in 1973, though on a far smaller scale.)

Different groups of Jews in the United States react variously to the idea of "ingathering". Most of them take a negative view of it. This, among others, was admitted by a certain A. Katz, who had at one time been director of the Youth Aliyah Department of the World Zionist Organisation. In terms of readiness to emigrate to Israel, he said, the American Jewish community could be compared to a pyramid. At its top were the wholeheartedly faithful Zionists who intended to resettle in Israel. Then came people with a high degree of Zionist consciousness not wishing to leave the Diaspora. These were followed by people active in Jewish affairs but not in the Zionist movement, and by those who had a sense of Jewishness but were not active in Jewish affairs. And at the base of the pyramid was the biggest group who had no more than a vague idea of Judaism. Katz estimated that each year some 100,000 members of this group lost their sense of identification with the Jewish people, that is, became assimilated. This testimony and other facts show that the process is irreversible, and that it is the strongest of the tendencies within the Jewish ethnic group in America.

¹ Walter Laqueur, *The Road to Jerusalem. The Origins of the Arab-Israeli Conflict 1967*, The Macmillan Company, New York, 1968, p. 223.

Katz's pyramid, it is true, ignores social distinctions and distinctions of age within its various segments. His sole criterion is the degree of Zionist or pro-Israel sentiment. Yet, often enough, American Jews who resettle in Israel are far removed from Zionism and have never taken part in pro-Israel activities. This applies to a certain part of people in retirement, who feel that the dollar pension they receive in the USA goes much farther in Israel, where the national currency declines in value at a breakneck pace.

Neither should we put too much trust in the "Zionist consciousness" referred to by Katz, who considers it as just about the most essential factor in the make-up of any American Jews emigrating to Israel. This consciousness should evidently be a sort of Israel-centric consciousness, an individual's ideological or moral orientation on living in Israel. Some segment of American Jews may doubtless be considered to possess this consciousness. But such people are a negligible minority.

A considerable number of those who may be considered bearers of a "Zionist consciousness", have no intention to emigrate to Israel. Katz, who refers them to the second segment of his pyramid, makes no bones about that. Their "Zionist consciousness" should evidently be understood as a system of notions that fills their needs above all as American citizens.

In the latter half of the 1970s and the early 80s, immigration from North America was insignificant. No longer do American Zionists react violently to Israeli demands to propagate the "ingathering" on a wider scale, for such propaganda can no longer lead to a mass exodus of American Jews to Israel, on the one hand, while the hue and cry helps Zionists in the USA to convert more American Jews to Zionism, on the other.

A negligible number of Jews from the USA doubtless come to Israel for a more or less lengthy stay. Cases of that sort are held up as examples to brainwash Jews in the nationalist spirit of the Jewish "Zionist consciousness".

From the first day of its existence, Israel proved unable

to generate economic development, let alone military expansion, on its own. Its leaders' plans of organising a massive influx of Jews from advanced capitalist states, had fallen through. The country became increasingly dependent on financial aid from abroad, above all from American Jews. Yet such aid depended above all on how industriously the friends of Israel worked within the United States. Events of the late 40s and early 50s showed that the most vigorous and effective in that respect were the American Zionists. These latter held, indeed, that instead of seeking to liquidate the American Diaspora, Israel should strive for its consolidation and growth.

In the early 1950s, this political and class-conscious interdependence of the Zionists ruling Israel and the bourgeois-nationalist Jewish establishment in America, which included the American Zionists, led to a compromise on the nature of the relationship between the Jewish State and the American Diaspora. Following a succession of protests by Zionist and non-Zionist organisations in the USA against the idea of liquidating the Diaspora, ruling quarters in Israel altered their approach. Ben-Gurion had no choice but to declare the following:

"The Jews of the United States, as a community and as individuals, have only one political attachment and that is to the United States of America. They owe no political allegiance to Israel. . . The Government and the people of Israel fully respect the right and integrity of the Jewish communities in other countries to develop their own mode of life and their indigenous social, economic and cultural institutions in accordance with their own needs and aspirations."¹

This compromise was inescapable for either side. (Not surprisingly, the ideological controversy over the "ingathering" had negative consequences for the American Zionists as well: their influence within the US Jewish community dropped visibly, and membership in Zionist organisations

¹ W. T. Mallison, "The Zionist-Israel Juridical Claims to Constitute Entity and to Confer Membership in it: Appraisal", *Public International Law*, Vol. 32, June 1964, No. 5, Washington, D. C.

declined.) Besides, it applied exclusively to the American Diaspora. This the Israeli Zionists had made quite clear by underscoring its "exclusiveness". Now they were able to conceal the fact that they had been compelled to renounce their maximalist demands concerning American Jews, while the American Zionists could claim a "special" place for themselves in the system of relations between the Diaspora as a whole and the Jewish State.

But the idea of "return" was not entirely removed from the order of the day even in relation to American Jews. It was indefinitely postponed, as it were. Bernard Reich, a student of the Middle East and its problems, noted rightly that "questions regarding the role of the Zionist movement since the establishment of the State of Israel; the definition of a 'Zionist'; the problem of *aliyah* by American Jewry; the position of Zionists and non-Zionists vis-à-vis the State of Israel and the priority accorded each group; as well as similar problems have all remained at the core of relations between the two Jewish communities and have provoked controversy on numerous occasions".¹

The crisis of the "ingathering" from Western countries, which undermines Israeli claims to being a state of the Jews of all the world, is being aggravated by the mass emigration, or more explicitly the flight, of Jews from Israel to the West, notably the United States. By the latter half of the 1970s, emigration had, indeed, exceeded immigration. It is estimated that at present between 300,000 and 500,000 former Israeli citizens of Jewish stock reside in the USA.

As a rule, prosperous Israelis pick the USA, where they lose no time to adapt themselves and often become conspicuous members of the American Jewish community. The reason why these people leave Israel is the same as the reason why US Jews are reluctant to move to Israel: the economic gap in America's favour, and the absence of normal conditions and safety.

¹ Bernard Reich, *Israel's Foreign Policy: A Case Study of Small State Diplomacy*, University Microfilms, Inc., Ann Arbor, Michigan, 1964, p. 189.

Owing to the imbalance between immigration and emigration to and from Israel, some Zionists in the United States have of late voiced an interesting thought: they said Israel is no more than a variant of the Diaspora and should therefore have no more rights than, say, the American Diaspora.

Frustrations and faults also mar Zionist plans to secure an influx of Jews from socialist countries.

The anti-Soviet campaign in "defence" of Soviet Jews, including their "right to leave" the Soviet Union, is one of the main preoccupations of American and Israeli Zionists, especially since the 1970s. It has more than one purpose: to obstruct detente, or, more precisely, any normalisation of Soviet-American relations. Not surprisingly, this won it the wholehearted support of rightists in the USA. Furthermore, it meant to provide Israel with a steady inflow of manpower.

By the end of the 1960s, when the influx from the Middle East and Northern Africa had virtually run dry, while emigration from the advanced capitalist states primarily from North America had, as I have shown, ceased to hold promise, only Jews of the Soviet Union and certain other socialist countries could, in theory, yield a new substantial flow of immigrants. In the early half of the 1970s the Zionists managed to secure such an influx through intensive international anti-Soviet activity, coupled with various acts of ideological diversion and with nationalist and religious propaganda beamed to Soviet citizens of Jewish background.

But the emigration of Jews from the Soviet Union created a variety of problems. Because Soviet Jews, as the Zionists discovered, were not the sort of material they had been counting on. They were people who had been born and raised in the Soviet environment, and who were bearers of notions, standards and traditions that were foreign to a capitalist society—and this regardless of their personal attitude towards life in the Soviet Union. The vast majority demanded the right to work, to free education and medical care, and so on—that is, rights they had had in the Soviet Union. Besides, the vast major-

ity were atheists. They could neither understand nor accept the Judaic restrictions imposed on public life in Israel.

The disappointment suffered by Jews from the Soviet Union added to the number of people who wanted to move to other countries, notably the USA. Apart from those who had resided in Israel for some time, this included those who were still being processed in transit centres in Vienna or Rome. The latter created the problem of *noshrim*, that is, of Soviet Jews who turned off the road to Israel. It was a problem that kept growing. As a result, Israel was deprived of the expected addition to its manpower. But that was not all. The *noshrim* problem meant that the propaganda howl over the "question of Soviet Jews" had largely fallen through. It meant, too, that Jews left the Soviet Union for reasons other than the "wish to return to the homeland of all Jews", and that, in any case, religion and ethnic origin did not play the role claimed by Israel's Zionist leadership. And this was aggravated by the fact that the large number of Soviet Jews who changed their minds and headed for the United States, Canada, other Western countries, instead of Israel, thereby refuted the claim that Israel was the homeland of the Jews of all the world.

In the early 1980s, the number of Jews leaving the Soviet Union declined sharply. Despite the evidence of influential Western quarters, which traced this decline above all to the failure of Zionist propaganda, Israel's inability to be an attractive centre of Jewish life, and other objective reasons, Zionist leaders in Israel and the United States continued to malign the Soviet Union and accused the Soviet authorities of obstructing Jewish emigration. By so doing, Zionists showed once again that their anti-Soviet stance is a sort of immutable aim in itself.

One more objective process blasting Zionism's theoretical basis and nullifying Zionist efforts to make Israel a homeland of the Jews of all the world, is the emergence of a distinctive Israeli nation.

In the 1950s, population growth in Israel was due mainly to the successive waves of the "ingathering", whereas in the 60s and 70s the accretion resulted increasingly from

the rising birth rate in Israel itself. The indigenous population, that is, citizens born in Israel and known as Sabras, grew visibly. In 1953 and 1954 they accounted for just 25 per cent of total, in 1967 for 42 per cent, and for as much as 53 per cent in 1978. "Almost all the rise over 1975," the *American Jewish Yearbook* reports, "resulted from natural increase, as most of the immigration was counter-balanced by emigration".¹

The factors making for the emergence of an Israeli nation include the existence of a central authority, common territory, the one language (Hebrew) spoken by the majority of the Jewish population, common traditions, common ways and behaviour, and so on. Another factor are mixed marriages among immigrants hailing from different countries.

A contributing factor is the emergence of a home-grown civil service. While the first-generation leaders of political parties and the government were, as a rule, people from other countries, these positions are now increasingly occupied by Sabras. And no small importance is being attached to substituting people born and raised in Israel for those known as the old guard. Many of the political forecasts are, indeed, based on this.

The formative stage of the Israeli nation is not yet over. And in the setting of a capitalist state it is naturally fraught with social and ethnic conflicts. Changes in the Middle East situation, and the immigration and emigration of Jews to and from Israel will no doubt have their effects. But the emergence of a specific Israeli nation is something that cannot be stopped. And as it gains pace, the ethnic, cultural and psychological distinctions between the Israeli population and the Jews in the Diaspora are growing deeper, with ever greater contradictions arising in relations between Zionists of different countries and also in the system of international Zionism as a whole.

"Zionist ideology and practice, which run counter to the interests of the peoples of the world, particularly the

¹ *American Jewish Yearbook 1978*, Jewish Publication Society of America, Philadelphia, 1977, p. 465.

people of Israel and the majority of Jews," we read in an article jointly produced by John Pittman, Political Bureau member of the CPUSA and Zahi Karkabi, Central Committee secretary of the CP of Israel, "were bound to create difficulties and bring on a crisis of the movement in the USA and other capitalist countries, as well as in Israel itself."¹

All Zionist efforts to conceal or minimise that crisis are in vain. Zionist theory and practice are contrary to the objective realities and are sure to be wiped out by the progressive march of history.

¹ *World Marxist Review*, March 1977.

T. Karaseva

**THE LATEST TENDENCIES
IN RELATIONS BETWEEN
ISRAEL AND JEWISH
COMMUNITIES ABROAD**

The system of Israel's relations with Jewish communities in countries of the capitalist world based on its "central place" in the life of the world Jewry, had, despite certain conflicting interests, functioned efficiently until the close of the 1970s.

Jews identify their interests naturally enough with those of the socially corresponding groups in the country of stay, while Israeli interests are for them secondary. For a long time, this occasioned no visible effects on the nature of Israel's relations with Jewish communities abroad. Because Jews in the West essentially accepted Zionist claims of Arab irreconcilability. They were constantly told that Arabs threaten the very survival of the Jewish state. They were told, too, that the sustained tensions in the Middle East were unavoidable in Israel's fight for security.

In recent years, however, leading members of Jewish communities outside Israel have been changing their view of the reasons for the unsettled state of the Arab-Israeli conflict. Israel's increasing aggressiveness at the junction of the 1970s and 80s dispelled the Zionist propaganda myth of Arab irreconcilability and of a threat to the survival of the Jewish state. The sharp drop in Menachem Begin's popularity in the West following Israel's aggression against Lebanon in 1982, also hit Israel's prestige and authority in Zionist and non-Zionist organisations in the Diaspora. The deepening economic and political crisis in Israel worked to the same end, creating a negative opinion of the country as a whole.

The social and economic problems have, indeed, become

so acute that Jews are leaving Israel for Europe and America. Of late, emigration has exceeded immigration. And Israeli emigrants settling in the West dispense information about the true state of affairs in Israel, and about the policy of its government. Its attractiveness for Jews abroad has waned as a result. No longer is the country seen as an object worthy of all-out support and a land for possible immigration.

Leaders of Jewish communities abroad are critical of the Israeli government's political line, and have tried to change the system of relations with Israel in the interests, above all, of the Jewish capitalist upper crust in Europe and America. This tendency has prompted Jews in the Diaspora to depart from the concept of a common destiny. More and more Jews tend to accept the parallel existence of Israel and the world Jewry.

A special place in the process belongs to the American Jewish community numbering some 6 million, whose Zionist organisations constitute the second most important centre of international Zionism. And by 1984 the critical view of Begin's policies taken by some Jewish leaders in the United States began to influence the nature of US-Israeli relations.

In the summer of 1977, when the Likud bloc first came to power in Tel Aviv, American Jews centered their attention on the Camp David process, the so-called normalisation of relations between Israel and Egypt. The tough Israeli stance at the talks with Egypt in 1978 and 1979, coupled with the unjustifiably extensive construction of Israeli settlements on the West Bank of the Jordan and the annexation of Eastern Jerusalem (on July 30, 1980) —all this was, in the opinion of Jewish leaders in America, slowing down what they called the peace process that was unfolding under US auspices. In the eyes of the world public, the Begin government's policy made Israel responsible for the sustained tension in the Middle East, and embarrassed American Jews who had been supporting Israel.

The new approach of many of the American Jewish organisations was reflected in the posture of some of their

leaders vis-à-vis the Likud government's handling of the issue of a Mid-East settlement. In August 1980, leaders of 56 Jewish organisations in the United States appealed to the Israeli Prime Minister, censuring his intransigence and the establishment of Israeli settlements on the West Bank. This, they said, was seen by many American Jews as a serious obstacle to peace in the Middle East. They were critical of the ultra-nationalist segment of the Israeli political spectrum, especially inside the government, for backing extremism and force on religious and chauvinist grounds. It also rejected the Israeli Prime Minister's demand that Jews abroad should unreservedly support all Israeli Middle-East actions.

The mounting critical sentiment dismayed Israel's more unqualified supporters in the United States, notably the leadership of the Zionist Organisation of America, which immediately tried to mitigate the situation. In the autumn of 1980, ZOA president Israel Novack expressed his displeasure over the criticism of Israeli policy, and appealed to Jews in Israel and the USA to achieve mutual understanding and accord.

The critical sentiment among American Jews increased in the summer of 1981, that is, after the Begin government was elected for a second term and toughened its Middle East stance, with US-made F-16 Israeli fighter-bombers raiding Baghdad (June 1981) and Beirut (July 1981), and bombing civilians.

At the end of July 1981, a delegation representing 37 Jewish organisations headed by Scudron, chairman of the Conference of Presidents of Major American Jewish Organisations, called on the Israeli Ambassador in Washington and expressed anxiety and disapproval over the stepped-up Israeli military activity against Lebanon.

Soon thereafter, Arthur Hertzberg, former president of the American Jewish Congress and now vice-president of the WJC, came out publicly against Begin. He spoke of the disaffection that ran high among many Jews in the USA over the Israeli air raids on Baghdad and Beirut, and the Begin government's settlements policy. "The specific policies of the Israeli government," he said, "are more

likely to be criticised in the Diaspora today than in the past.”¹

A large segment of the American Jewish community took a negative view, too, of Israel's annexation of the Syrian Golan Heights in December 1981. Some Jews publicly condemned this new act of expansionism. The Zionist Organisation of America leaders were alone in publicly backing that annexation.

In 1981, opposition to Israel's Middle East policy led, among other things, to the emergence in the USA of a number of new organisations, and among them the New Jewish Agenda, whose members backed the anti-war Peace Now movement in Israel. At one of its conferences, the New Jewish Agenda group passed a resolution favouring the right of Jews and Palestinian Arabs to self-determination in Palestine. In the spring of 1983, it protested to Begin against the bombing of Beirut and Israeli aggressions in Lebanon. It called again for direct talks between Israel and the Palestinians, including the PLO, on a basis of mutual recognition and peaceful coexistence,² and objected to the continued building of settlements on the West Bank and in the Gaza Strip.

The first national convention of the New Jewish Agenda in July 1985, was attended by 4,000 delegates. Its Middle East resolution stressed that the Soviet Union should take part in hammering out a peace settlement of the Middle East conflict. This was the first time this view was voiced. It also stressed that there should be “negotiations with the representatives both of the Palestinians and the Israelis”, and that “the Jordanian-PLO initiative” should be included in “the pursuit of peace options”.³

The mounting criticism of Begin's extremism by American Jews questioned the unreserved US backing of Israel. As a result, supporters of Israel's course encountered public disapproval.

The opinion that Israel with its extremist leaders was

¹ *Middle East International*, September 18, 1981.

² *Middle East International*, April 15, 1983.

³ *Jewish Currents*, September 1985.

beginning to be a burden for the United States was spreading rapidly in the US Jewish communities. Also, American Jews disapproved of the Israeli Zionists' view about it being their duty to see to the survival of the Jewish state, which they qualified as a ploy for receiving more financial aid from America's Jewish organisations.

In fact, the Begin government was creating additional impasses for any settlement of the Arab-Israeli conflict even along the lines favoured by America, prompting many American Jewish leaders to speak out for a more flexible approach.

In December 1981, a study entitled "The Road to Peace", which had been drawn up in collaboration with Philip Klutznick, President Emeritus of the World Jewish Congress, had been submitted to the Reagan Administration to help it work out a Middle East posture. The paper merits a closer look. Its emphasis is on settling the Palestinian problem. It makes clear that no lasting peace is possible in the Middle East if the Palestinians are excluded from the negotiations.

The critical mood concerning some Likud policies evidently influenced the size of the US Jews' financial aid to Israel. According to a report from Washington in the *Jerusalem Post International*, there had been a quiet decline in certain contributions which, the report said, was due to displeasure over some of the aspects of Israeli policy.¹

Jewish communities in other countries, too, were critical of Begin's course. At the annual meeting of the council of Canada's Jewish federations, held in November 1979 in Montreal, some federations criticised the Begin government for its stance, notably concerning the occupied Arab territories. In the opinion of many of its participants, the meeting symbolised a change of attitude in the Diaspora. Never again, they said, would there be unconditional and unreserved support.²

In March 1980, a Committee of Left Jews was formed

¹ *Jerusalem Post International*, November 15-21, 1981.

² *Haaretz*, February 20, 1979.

in France. Its manifesto demanded that Jews abroad take a critical view of whatever Israel did. It condemned discrimination of Arabs and called for dialogue with the Palestinians, notably the PLO.

An Open Letter sent by 100 English Jews to the *Jerusalem Post* in June 1981 protested against the policies of the Likud bloc. They supported the Maarah in the general elections then taking place in Israel. Israeli Zionists attacked the letter as "intolerable interference" in the elections and even in "the internal affairs of a sovereign state".

The criticism of Begin's policy by Jews abroad was received in Israel as a blockbuster destroying its political pillars.

The critical mood of Jews abroad was naturally reflected in the activity of their Zionist organisations, and in that of the World Zionist Organisation. The differences between Israeli Zionists and Zionist leaders abroad may be traced, above all, to the wishes of the American Jewish bourgeoisie to head and direct the international Zionist centres. The leadership of the American Jewish community, the biggest of the centres of international Zionism, was displeased that the final word still belonged to the Israelis, and that the Israeli government was trying to reduce the activity of Zionist organisations abroad to unquestioning support of its policy. Most Zionist leaders in the West reject this approach. Mrs Jacobson, former president of the Jewish Agency—the American branch of the WZO—and head of the Jewish National Fund, said the main problem was "Israel's decision not to share leadership responsibility with the Diaspora".¹

A controversy raged, too, between those who conceived Israel as the centre whose actions should be unconditionally backed (such as the Zionist Organisation of America), and those who held that Jewish communities, wherever they were, could criticise Israel's home and foreign policies.

Some prominent Zionists in the West did not question the need for supporting the State of Israel, and directed

¹ *The Jerusalem Post*, Supplement, Special Issue, November 1982.

their criticism essentially at what they described as a few "ideological" issues. Above all, they objected to the urgings of the revisionist nucleus of the Likud bloc, and its supporters abroad, to secure wholesale and total emigration to Israel, and its opposition to claims of "equitable partnership" by Western Zionist leaders.

The Begin government's expansionism created objections even among those who usually supported Israel's foreign policy. For the first time, Jewish communities in the West criticised Begin's bid to annex occupied Arab territories. In 1983, the annual conference of British Zionist federations censured Israel for failing to initiate some form of autonomy for the West Bank and the Gaza Strip, and for refusing to negotiate with the Palestinians.¹

It will not be amiss to note here, however, that any differences between Diaspora Zionists and the Israeli government did not create any basic change in the former's attitude to the essential Zionist ideological concepts.

The 29th and 30th congresses of the World Zionist Organisation, held in 1978 and 1982 in Jerusalem, had a strong bearing on subsequent relations between the Israeli leadership and the Diaspora. At the 29th Congress, Diaspora leaders wrested some far-reaching concessions from the Israeli Zionists concerning international Zionism and Israel's home policy. The unequal status in Israel of Oriental Jews and their disproportionately low representation in the governing bodies of the Israeli state and in the World Zionist Organisation was sharply criticised.

The danger that ethnic and communal contradictions in Israel would come out of control, prompted WZO leaders to look for ways of overcoming social contrasts.

On the insistence of Diaspora Jews, the Congress passed a resolution on "religious pluralism". This reflected dissatisfaction over the predominance of orthodox parties in Israel, which had grown into a leading religious group in the World Zionist Organisation and Jewish Agency, and, in effect, controlled all matters related to religion within that organisation. Besides, under pressure of American

¹ *Jewish Chronicle*, June 10, 1983.

Zionist organisations, the 29th Congress of the WZO acknowledged the right of Diaspora Jews not to emigrate to Israel (though under "classical" Zionism, immigration to the Promised Land was the duty of every Zionist), and accepted the fact that Israel could not survive without Diaspora support.

In other words, international Zionism officially discarded the idea of universal immigration and accepted the independence of the Diaspora, moving away from the idea that the Jews in the Diaspora needed the State of Israel to the idea that the State of Israel needed the Jews in the Diaspora. This was most definitely a revision of certain basic Zionist concepts.

At the same time, however, the 29th Congress of the WZO backed Begin's aggressive foreign policy in a resolution affirming confidence in the Israeli government. The Congress reaffirmed that "the right of the Jewish people to the Land of Israel is inalienable."¹

Acting on these resolutions, Zionists abroad began interfering in the Israeli government's policy. When Begin sought to win votes in 1981 with concessions to orthodox religious parties, and tried to introduce some of the more reactionary dogmas of orthodox Judaism in Israeli society, a group of members of the WZO Executive sent him a cable of protest.

Zionist leaders abroad refer ever more often to their disappointment in Israel, which has failed to become the democratic miracle, the lofty ethical society that it was expected to become. In a bid to work out a single WZO policy and to achieve mutual understanding between Israel and the Diaspora, a group of WZO leaders under Aryel Dulzin, Chairman of the WZO Executive, and Avraham Schenker, Head of the Department of Development and Services of the WZO, organised what they termed Zionist seminars.

The last of these, named "Towards a Zionist Renaissance", was held in the summer of 1982 in Jerusalem during

¹ *Resolutions of the 29th WZO Congress*, Jerusalem, 1979, p. 23.

the preparations for the 30th WZO Congress and shortly before Israel's aggression in Lebanon. The main purpose of the seminar was to work out new ways and means whereby the WZO would retain control over Jewish communities in the Diaspora. Instead, sharp criticism of Israel itself was sounded at the seminar. Some of its participants stressed that Zionism's crisis reflected the crisis of Israel, and that the gravitation towards greater balance between the obsolete provisions of "classical" Zionism and the realities of today stood essentially for a modification of basic Zionist ideological concepts. This, in turn, they said, showed that the international Zionist movement was in the throes of a crisis.

In December 1982, the 30th Congress of the WZO gathered in the tense atmosphere created by the Israeli aggression in Lebanon. According to most of the delegates it was a complete failure. Obviously, WZO activity and methods had to be cardinally retailored. Many delegates arrived at the conclusion that the Zionist movement required thorough overhaul if it wanted to recover.¹ The *Jewish Chronicle*, organ of the British Zionists, wrote that the WZO congresses in 1972 and 1978 had also shown the need for reconstructing the Zionist movement, which fact the 30th Congress only underlined.

For the first time since Israel had come into being, participants in a Congress disavowed some of the policies of the Israeli government. There was a clash between Likud followers and the opposition in the Political Committee of the Congress during the voting on Jewish settlements in occupied territories. Countering a Likud resolution which justified the government, the opposition parties (Labour Zionists, the Zionist-Reformist group, the Civil Rights Movement, and the Shinuy), backed by delegates of the American Zionist organisations, adopted a resolution calling for territorial concessions to the neighbouring Arab states, and for a freeze on building settlements in occupied territories densely inhabited by Arabs

¹ *Jewish Chronicle*, December 31, 1982.

on the West Bank and in the Gaza Strip. The resolution did not object to settlements being built in Galilee, Negev, and the region of Arava. The Likud delegates, though they tried to twist the arms of the opposition, failed to have the resolution annulled. A compromise was reached not to have a final resolution on settlements in occupied territories. In fact, however, this was a defeat for Likud, while the posture of the opposition parties and most of the Diaspora delegates was seen as unprecedented because previously the WZO leadership never failed to support the basic points in Israel's foreign policy.

The Israeli rulers also failed to drag through a resolution in support of President Yitzhak Navon's call for all real Zionists to be ready to settle in Israel.¹ Despite their insistence that Jewish immigration was crucial, Zionists had had to admit that Israel was becoming less attractive to immigrants.² Raphael Kotlovitz, director of the Aliyah department of the Jewish Agency, noted, indeed, that Jewish immigration to Israel was "worse than it has ever been in the past 25 years".³

The crisis of Zionism and the WZO is above all evidence of the disaffection felt by young people in the Diaspora. A declaration of the 30th Congress of the WZO said young Jews "have found other channels of activity, distant from those of Zionism and Judaism".⁴

That young Jews are turning their backs on Zionism and the WZO is continuously noted by various Zionist federations. English Zionist leaders, for example, note that young Jews in Britain are disappointed in the Zionist ideals. Membership in local Zionist organisations and the WZO is shrinking. The influence of Zionist federations in

¹ *The Guardian*, December 16, 1982.

² Despite a few "peak figures", immigration is declining steadily. More than 170,000 came in 1950, with as little as 24,500 in 1960. In 1970, the number went up to 36,700, but in 1981 fell again, with only 12,600 coming to Israel, and only 5,900 of them taking Israeli citizenship.

³ *Israel and Palestine Political Report*, No. 98, June-July 1983, p. 12.

⁴ *Resolutions of the 30th Zionist Congress*, Jerusalem, 1983, p. 41.

countries of Western Europe and in America is declining.

It is, therefore, obvious that international Zionism and its main organ, the World Zionist Organisation, are in the grips of a crisis. Owing to the predominance of Israeli Zionists in the governing bodies of the WZO, the latter automatically support Israel's extremist policies. Yet this extremism is not accepted by the Jewish communities abroad. This is reflected in the position of the so-called non-Zionist organisations of the Diaspora, essentially affiliated with the World Jewish Congress.

The WJC itself stands for "nationalism in the Diaspora". Though the organisation acknowledges the main provisions of Zionism—the "exclusiveness" of the Jewish nation, Israel's central place in Jewish life, and the like—they are not given priority. The WJC considers the Diaspora an autonomous and legitimate part of world Jewry. It therefore recognises the right of Jews outside Israel to have their particular attitude towards the policy of the Israeli government, including public criticism. It also opposes attempts of the Israeli government to control the life and activity of Jewish communities abroad. "There is a tendency in Israel," World Jewish Congress leaders say, "sometimes to interfere too much with the daily problems of Jewish life in the Diaspora."¹

As a result, strains and frictions have appeared between the WZO and WJC in recent years. Indeed, the state of relations between these two major international Jewish bourgeois nationalist organisations is today a barometer of the relationship between Israel and the Diaspora as a whole.

Making the most of its formal signboard of a non-Zionist organisation, the WJC is out to encompass all Jewish organisations in the world. Unlike the WZO, whose leaders are rigidly committed to ensure emigration of Jews to Israel, the official aim of the WJC is to promote the interests of Jews all over the world. The substance of the differences that prevail between the WJC and WZO today

¹ *New Middle East*, October 1972.

amounts to a disparate understanding of the objectives of Jewish bourgeois nationalism in the prevailing international situation. At the centre of the controversy is the question of Israel's place and role in the life of Jewry abroad.

The WJC challenges Israel's claim to represent Jews of the Diaspora and its demand that Jews abroad must "unconditionally and unreservedly" support Israel. Yet the WJC agrees with the WZO that Israel's existence is important and it must be supported by Jews all over the world. Owing to the fact that members of the WZO are also members of some of the governing bodies of the WJC, unity over immigration to Israel and Israel-centrism is incomplete.

The differences between the WZO and WJC over the attitude to Israel surfaced most sharply at the 7th General Assembly of the World Jewish Congress in January 1981. The criticism of the Israeli leadership by the so-called Bronfman group, consisting of Klutznick, Haon and Hertzberg, was broadly supported. Bronfman declared that the "ingathering" no longer held any attraction for most Jews, and that Jews in the Diaspora should not be expected to blindly back the Israeli government.

The Israeli government and leaders of the WZO went out of their way to belittle the meaning of this criticism. Aryeh Dulzin, President of the WZO, and President of Israel Yitzhak Navon tried to prevent Bronfman's election to the post of president of the WJC, but the vast majority of delegates at the Assembly voted for him. The Zionist press attacked the Bronfman group, describing it as a group of millionaire non-Zionists who had no right to speak for the Jewish communities in the Diaspora. The Zionist Organisation of America, too, tried to rouse anti-Bronfman sentiment in the North American branch of the WJC, but most of its affiliated organisations sided with the Bronfman-Klutznick line. The same applied to WJC branches in Western Europe and Latin America.

The so-called new relationship between Israel and Jewish communities abroad reposes, as the present WJC leadership sees it, on Israel's recognition of the particular interests of Diaspora Jews and the independent role of their

bourgeois elite. Pressure on Israel's part is rejected.

Of late, most WJC leaders have been distinctly in favour of the so-called national cultural autonomy of Jews in their countries of stay. This is in the interests of capitalists of Jewish origin who have not, in principle, renounced the traditional Zionist concept of emigration to Israel.

A report by a commission of the WJC noted that Israel was inflicting great harm on itself and the Diaspora by its short-sighted policy of setting up new settlements in occupied Arab territories. But the authors came out against the establishment of a Palestinian state and backed the so-called Jordanian option promoted by the US government.¹

At present, the WJC had begun to interfere more actively in the affairs of Israel and the World Zionist Organisation. The WJC leadership, notably Edgar Bronfman, are trying to seize the initiative in organising immigration from European countries and in the notorious question of "defending Soviet Jews" and their "free immigration" to Israel. In addition, Bronfman has taken upon himself the role of mediator concerning resumption of diplomatic relations between the Soviet Union and Israel. The WJC leadership has taken certain steps in that direction, including a visit to Moscow by Bronfman. The rightist parties in Israel and pro-Likud elements in the WZO oppose Bronfman's "initiative", saying that the WJC, formally a non-Zionist organisation, has no right to meddle in Zionist immigration and Israel's foreign policy.

There were conflicting views on Israel's aggression in Lebanon in the summer of 1982 within Israeli society, as well as in the Jewish communities abroad. During the 1956 and 1967 aggressions, and during the war of October 1973, the Zionist establishment still managed to create the appearance of unity among Jewish communities in the West. Yet during the Lebanon invasion the Jewish Diaspora broke up into two camps—one that blindly supported Israel and one that criticised the Likud government. This

¹ The Jordanian option rules out establishment of an independent Palestinian state.

division appeared in the opening stage of the war and not, as was the case before, after the conflict had ended (when the public began to review the course taken by the government).

When the aggression of 1982 began, Zionists abroad mounted a powerful propaganda campaign in support of Israel. A collection of funds began to cover at least part of the cost of the military operations in Lebanon. The Joint Jewish Appeal (a Zionist organisation collecting funds among Jews abroad for Israel) expected to send the aggressor more than 100 million dollars before the end of the year. Some 800 volunteers of American Jewish descent went to Israel to replace conscripted workmen. WZO leaders showered threats on those who dared criticise the Begin government. A month after the Israeli aggression in Lebanon began, the WJC Executive again characteristically expressed support for the Likud government's expansionist policy. It approved of its government Peace for Galilee action, which it described as a defensive operation.

All the same, the Zionist leaders failed to silence criticism of Begin's government among Jewish communities in the West. Public opinion within the Jewish communities was also influenced by the negative reaction of a number of West European governments. Furthermore, the scale of the aggression obviously exceeded the alleged PLO threat to Israel's security, which Israeli propaganda howled about on the eve of the aggression.

The Diaspora Jews' criticism of Israeli actions in Lebanon dovetailed with the already existing and growing disaffection over the Likud government's stance in the matter of a Mideast settlement. Many Jews in the Diaspora saw the aggression in Lebanon as fresh proof of Begin's extremism, which compromised those who were on Israel's side in the eyes of the world public. Some Jewish leaders feared that the international denunciation of the atrocities committed by the Israeli army would generate anti-Semitic sentiment in the West. In June 1982, some 500 prominent Jews in France held a protest demonstration outside the Israeli Embassy, demanding an end to the aggression and

withdrawal of Israeli troops from Lebanon. Similar Jewish pickets gathered outside Israeli embassies in the FRG, Austria, and Denmark.

The British Federation of Women Zionists (a local branch of the WIZO) publicly denounced the war in Lebanon. Brenda Katten, its chairperson, said at a conference in the spring of 1983 that the war had legitimised anti-Semitism and created division both in the Jewish communities and in Israel.¹ The Peace for Galilee operation of the Israel government, she added, had created grave difficulties for her Federation. But such protests were neither massive nor organised.

The liberal segment of the Jewish community in Britain formed several organisations and held conferences and meetings condemning the militarist policy of the Likud bloc. The Campaign for Israel-Palestine Peace sent a group of scholars of Jewish origin to Lebanon to study the situation and investigate the consequences of the aggression.

The Jewish community in the United States was visibly divided over the Lebanon issue. In June 1982, six hundred American Jews, 40 of them rabbis, called on Begin through *The New York Times* to withdraw his troops from Lebanon and negotiate with the Palestinians on a basis of mutual recognition.

Three influential Jewish leaders—Philip Klutznick, Nahum Goldmann, and Pierre Mendes-France—called on the Israeli government at the end of June 1982 to halt the war in Lebanon, lift the siege of West Beirut, and begin negotiations with the PLO. They said it was essential to settle the Palestinian problem in a broader political framework than provided for by the Camp David agreement.

This initiative won support in a number of Jewish communities. In Canada, for example, the so-called Middle East Discussion Group appealed to Prime Minister Pierre Trudeau to assume a more active role in furthering the initiative and work for “a national home in Palestine for the Palestinian people”.² The World Zionist Organisation

¹ See *Jewish Chronicle*, March 4, 1983.

² *The Globe and Mail*, August 2, 1982.

rallied its followers to counter this criticism of the Lebanon invasion. It decided to raise the issue at a meeting of the World Jewish Congress Executive in July 1982 in Paris. Aryeh Dulzin, President of the WZO, did not attend in protest to the meeting being held in Paris, not Jerusalem. But his followers in the Executive urged stripping Klutznick and Goldmann of their honorary offices in the WJC. Their attempt failed. Though the final document of the meeting expressed the Executive's "complete solidarity" with Israel, it also referred to the lawful rights of the Palestinian people, which should be respected. Edgar Bronfman had, in effect, sided with the Klutznick-Goldmann-Mendes-France statement. He called for a cease-fire and for peace negotiations in a setting of mutual recognition.¹

Jews in the Diaspora had begun to criticise Israel's Lebanon adventure long before opposition erupted in Israel itself. In the Western Jewish communities, critical sentiment appeared chiefly among the so-called liberal intelligentsia, the business world, religious circles, and also some leaders of Jewish organisations.

It is not amiss to note, that the critics disagreed not only with the Likud bloc's "autonomy" plan for Arabs of the West Bank and in the Gaza Strip, but also with the Maarah bloc's approach based on the Allon Plan. They called for negotiations with the PLO and for the establishment of Palestinian statehood on the West Bank and in the Gaza Strip, and also for mutual recognition of the national rights of Jews and Arabs.

The July 1984 Parliamentary elections in Israel confirmed that the extreme right had gained ground in the country. The two leading blocs, Maarah and Likud, each won one-third of the seats in the Knesset and were compelled to form a national unity government representing both blocs.

One of the conspicuous election results, showing an ideological evolution rightward, was the lunge into the political arena of fascist-minded parties. Meir Kahane's ultraright Kah party managed, for the first time, to win a seat in the Knesset.

¹ *Middle East International*, July 16, 1982.

The national unity government changed nothing in the approach to the Mid-East conflict. No real unity was achieved concerning the principal issues of foreign policy, which, of course, did not fail to affect Israel's relationship with Jewish communities in the Diaspora, notably that of the United States.

The outcome of the elections in Israel disappointed many leaders of Zionist and non-Zionist organisations in the USA. Though the Jewish organisations assured the Israeli government that there would be no change in the traditionally close cooperation between the government and the people of the USA and Israel, many of them deplored that Shimon Peres failed to obtain a big enough majority to form a Maarah government. While American Likud followers said they were sure that whatever government was formed in Israel, it would not "surrender one inch of Judea and Samaria".¹

Many leaders of the Zionist Federation in Britain hold that the foreign policy of a Labour government would lead to a Mid-East solution more speedily than Likud's. Dr. Maurice Miller, co-president of the Poale Zion, the labour movement of the British Jewry, stressed that Maarah was the only force capable of putting Israel on the right road. "Israel does not need more land," Miller pointed out. "For a fraction of what has been spent on settlements in Judea and Samaria, Galilee and Negev might be settled by Jews."²

The majority of the Jewish leaders abroad, however, are most rigidly pro-Israeli. Yet these days they distinguish between the interests of the Israeli state and the policy of each specific Israeli government. An ever greater number of American Jewish leaders, for example, are demanding that the Peres-Shamir government resist the attempts of orthodox Jews to amend the Law of Return.³ The major

¹ *Jerusalem Post*, July 26, 1984.

² *Jewish Chronicle*, June 20, 1984.

³ Yitzhak Shamir, who became premier after Begin quit the political scene in 1983, again promised the religious parties in return for their support on the eve of the 1984 elections, that he would amend the Law of Return concerning the definition of

Zionist, bourgeois nationalist, and non-orthodox religious organisations in the United States, such as the American Jewish Congress, B'nai B'rith, and the United Jewish Appeal, are strongly opposed to any amendment of that Law.

Max Fisher, head of the Jewish Agency, has said on this score that many American Jews "feel disillusioned and decrease identification with Israel".¹ Horowitz, president of the United Jewish Appeal, the organisation's National Chairman Grass, and chairman of its board Loup, declared in a cable to Peres and Shamir, however, that any matter Israel may undertake in furtherance of the vital interests of Jews throughout the world "should not be decided unilaterally in Israel, but should be considered in consultation with the Diaspora".²

As we see, since the elections Jewish leaders abroad are trying to influence the situation in Israel. Besides, large enough segments of the Jewish communities abroad do not conceal their negative sentiment concerning the growing influence in Israeli society of fascist-minded parties and organisations, and especially the Kah party. In the opinion of Theodore Mann, president of the American Jewish Congress, "Kahane is an extremist whose views are endorsed by a negligible minority of American Jews", while Henry Siegman, AJC executive director, stressed that any significant increase in Kahane's following in Israel may "adversely affect" the relationship between American Jewry and Israel.³

While continuing its policy of ensuring Israel's military superiority over the Arab world, the national unity government is taking steps to improve the health of the country's

affinity to the Jewish nation. The orthodox religious parties insist that only those are Jews who are born of a Jewish mother or who adopted Judaism strictly by orthodox canon. Non-orthodox Judaic organisations abroad are actively opposed to the attempts of the orthodox parties in Israel to dominate the international Zionist scene undividedly.

¹ *Jerusalem Post*, international edition, August 12-18, 1984.

² *Ibid.*

³ *Ibid.*, July 29-August 4, 1984.

economy as suggested by the US Administration. This means still closer adherence to the United States, and widening the channels for direct US interference in Israel's internal affairs. US influence on Israeli policies is facilitated by the country's unsound economic condition, fraught also with a further growth of the influence of the US Jewish community on Israel's home and foreign policy. As a result, it is quite possible that the American centre of international Zionism will gain in stature and a tactical struggle will ensue between it and the Israeli leaders for top influence on international Zionism.

The growing contradictions between Israel and the Jewish communities abroad, and the latter's stronger criticism of the Israeli government should, in a sense, be seen as Zionism's defeat in the bid for absolute influence on Jews all over the world.

U. Artemiev

DISCRIMINATION AGAINST ORIENTAL JEWS IN ISRAEL

The annexation and occupation of Arab territories, arrests, persecution of thousands of peaceful Arab citizens, torture in prisons and in concentration camps on occupied territory and in Israel proper, the atrocities of Zionist intruders in long-suffering Lebanon, and the plentiful evidence of desecrating Muslim cultural and religious monuments—these are all acts of racism in relation to neighbouring Arab peoples.

The more than 600,000 Arabs in Israel are objects of discrimination. It extends to practically all spheres. The removal of several Arab families to the Jewish Upper Nazareth, for example, though seemingly an insignificant act, precipitated a terrible outcry. The ministry in charge of house building held special meetings to try and squash the incipient scandal.

Racism also poisons relations among Jews from different continents. Jews from the Middle East and Northern Africa are in an inferior position. Ethnic friction among Jews interweaves with class problems and causes a still greater polarisation. The situation is so complicated that some Israelis have begun to speak worriedly of the spectre of civil war. President Yitzhak Navon said recently he was disturbed, "because the dangers we are facing inside are more serious than the external threat".¹

In its early years, Zionism, which came into being in European countries at the end of the 19th century among

¹ *The New York Times*, April 6, 1983.

Jews of Ashkenazi¹ origin and bourgeois background, made practically no impact among Jews of Asian and North African origin.² The first colonists came to Palestine from Europe. At that time, Jews were already living in Palestine, most of them for religious reasons, their ancestors having lived there for centuries or having returned long before Zionism appeared. In 1918, the Jewish community in Palestine numbered some 56,000, with 20,000 of them Orientals. This was a mere 8 per cent of the population, with members of the Jewish community owning just 2.5 per cent of the land.³

As researchers, including Arabs, emphasise, the indigenous population of Jews in Palestine had stable connections with the Arab population. But in the days of the British mandate, the Zionist colonisation, Ashkenazim seized key positions on the political and economic scene of the local Jewish community, and, indeed, in the country as a whole. The Zionists set their sights on ousting Arabs from the land, the economy and political affairs. As a result, not only Arabs but also indigenous Palestinian Jews lost their place in the political arena, where they had in a way acted as intermediaries between Palestinians and the Ottoman Empire. They lost their hold on the country's economy.

Yet the number of Oriental Jews in Palestine was then still insignificant. By 1948, there were 600,000 Jews in the country, of whom only 70,000 (11.7 per cent) had come from Asian and African lands.⁴ Between 1919 and 1948, as many as 385,000 Jews had come to Palestine from Europe and America, and only 44,800 from Asia and Africa (89.6 and 10.4 per cent respectively).⁵

After the establishment of the State of Israel, its economic needs and aggressive Zionist expansionist designs required hundreds of thousands of cheap labourers and obedient "soldiers of Zion".

¹ *Ashkenazi*—a Jew hailing from any of the European countries or America.

² Oriental Jews hail essentially from Arab countries.

³ *The World Today*, No. 4, 1967, p. 154.

⁴ *The World Today*, No. 4, 1967, p. 153.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 154.

"It is hard to escape the impression," writes Elfi Pallis, an Israeli journalist living in London, "that to regard Oriental Jews as only capable of menial work happened to fit the need of post-1948 Israel for a Jewish proletariat that could replace the Palestinians."¹

In those years, large-scale Zionist campaigns urged Jews in Yemen, Morocco, Iraq, Algeria and other Eastern countries to emigrate to Israel. Zionists encouraged anti-Semitism in Arab countries, while maintaining that it had resulted from the establishment of the State of Israel. In fact, however, anti-Jewish sentiment in Arab countries was a response to aggressive Zionist policies, seizures of traditionally Arab lands, and violence against hundreds of thousands of Palestinian Arabs.

The facts show that Zionist agents had provoked the "flight" of Jews from Arab countries to Israel. "The impact of Zionism since 1948," wrote American author Alfred M. Lillienthal, "has shattered the peaceful existence that Jews enjoyed among their Arab brethren for millennia. Zionist agents, by instilling fear of imminent persecution and by other propaganda weapons, have already drawn more than 700,000 Jews out of Iraq, Yemen, Syria, Egypt, Tunisia, Algeria, and Morocco. . . . Their immigration was accomplished not primarily for the sake of the immigrants, but to meet Israeli needs for money, manpower, and military strength."²

Still, the notion (originating from Zionists and fairly widespread in Israel) that Oriental Jews hate the Arabs for allegedly persecuting them, is either incorrect, or at least, simplistic. "Sephardim have mixed experiences in the Arab countries where many of them lived", David K. Shipler reports in the *New York Times*. "Those from Morocco often speak nostalgically of their cordial relations with the Arab majority, although anti-Jewish riots broke out after Israel was created in 1948."³

¹ *Middle East International*, January 29, 1982.

² Alfred M. Lillienthal, *The Other Side of the Coin. An American Perspective of the Arab-Israeli Conflict*, Devin-Adair Company, New York, 1965, pp. 35-36.

³ *The New York Times*, April 8, 1983.

As a result of Zionist action in some Arab countries, their Jewish communities had practically to a man resettled in Israel. From 1948 to 1962, in fact, Jews arriving in Israel from Europe and America numbered 479,000, and from Asia and Africa 575,500 (45.4 and 54.6 per cent respectively).¹ As a result Oriental Jews comprised a considerable segment of the Jewish population. By the 1970s, the number of Oriental Jews equalled that of Ashkenazim, and by the mid-1970s, owing to a higher birth rate among them, they became the majority. At present, they account for nearly 60 per cent of the Jewish population of Israel.²

The numerical correlation of Oriental Jews and Ashkenazim has been an object of numerous sociological forecasts, because Zionists see Oriental Jews as a menace to Israel's image as a "bastion of Western democracy in the Middle East", threatening Israel's easternisation. Without going into this Zionist "concept", we may indeed note that today Oriental Jews are a considerable ethnic section of Israel's Jewish population, whose place in society strongly influences the class pattern and the intensity of class conflicts. The proletarianisation of the bulk of Oriental Jews is becoming ever more obvious, while the prosperous and influential Ashkenazim are seizing more and more economic and political power.

This process has gone so far, writes Elfi Pallis, that now the term "Oriental Jew" has become synonymous with "working class", and the gap between the two communities continues to grow. He quotes a certain Dr. Svirsky, who says that the difference today is "so immense that future educational changes and longer residence in Israel are unlikely to reduce it greatly".³

In fact, no change is in sight. What is more, the abyss is growing wider, and the discrimination against Oriental Jews is greater in all areas of Israeli life. We see it in employment, in education and culture, in housing, and so forth.

¹ *The World Today*, April 1967, p. 154.

² *Middle East International*, January 21, 1983.

³ *Middle East International*, January 29, 1982.

The difference in the condition of Western and Oriental Jews is seen in boldest relief when comparing their respective living standards. In 1982 the Central Bureau of Statistics reported that the gross income of urban wage-earners from the Middle East and North Africa was 40 per cent lower than that of wage-earners with Ashkenazi background.¹

The obviously window-dressed statistics of Israel's social security bureau shows that today half a million Israelis (with a total population of 4 million) live below the so-called poverty line.² Eighty-five per cent of them are Jews of Oriental origin.³

Nearly 50 per cent of the employed Oriental Jews are unskilled workers. This is typical, because Jews from Asia and Africa constitute 61 per cent of all wage labourers, while Ashkenazi Jews constitute 39 per cent, and hold the higher paid jobs.⁴ Top officials, executives of state and private enterprises, academics and leaders of organisations, writes Richard Mathews, an English journalist, are nearly all of European or American background.⁵ The Histadruth, Israel's general federation of labour, for example, had only four Oriental Jews among its 55 top officials in 1984.⁶

A well-orchestrated system of discrimination against Oriental Jews is operated in the educational field. It is so designed as to direct young people of Oriental background to vocational or agricultural schools rather than general schools. In the 1978/79 school year, more than 64 per cent of the enrolment in vocational and agricultural schools was Sephardic, and only 39 per cent Sephardic in general schools.⁷ And the quality of the education received by Oriental Jews leaves much to be desired. Most of them fail admission tests to higher educational establishments, where marks, standard tests and interviews serve as criteria. It

¹ *Middle East International*, January 29, 1982.

² *Le Monde diplomatique*, septembre 1984.

³ *Le Nouvel Observateur*, janvier 14-20, 1983.

⁴ *Cahiers du Communisme*, septembre, 1977.

⁵ *The Middle East*, June 1977.

⁶ *Middle East International*, January 29, 1982.

⁷ *The New York Times*, April 7, 1983.

is not surprising, therefore, that in 1978/79 only 17.5 per cent of all university students were Sephardic and 71.8 per cent Ashkenazic.¹

The system of vocational training is unsatisfactory. David Harman, an Israeli educator, says vocational school graduates "never go into the labour market utilising the skills they have been taught".² While unemployment is going up. According to Histadruth figures 9 per cent of the active population was out of work at the end of 1984. The vast majority, doubtless, are young people from Oriental Jewish communities, whose opportunities for extending their knowledge and utilising their training, are limited.

What makes matters worse is that the official racist spirit of the State of Israel attunes parents, teachers, and, consequently, Ashkenazi pupils too, to discriminating against Oriental Jews. They are contemptuously called "cave dwellers" and "scum of the earth". Attempts to establish joint education of Oriental Jewish and Ashkenazi children encounter vicious resistance. Forcible measures to that effect do not help. In January 1983, fines and suspended jail sentences were resorted to against some two dozen fathers of first grade Ashkenazic pupils for refusing to send their children to a school in a quarter mostly peopled by Oriental Jews.³

Paying tuition for their children is a heavy burden for Oriental Jews. As a result, according to official figures for 1976-1978, 10 per cent of Sephardic youngsters from the ages of 14 to 17 neither worked nor studied, compared with 3.4 per cent of Ashkenazim in the same age bracket.⁴ There is not enough money for tuition because, as a rule, Oriental Jews have more children than Jews from Europe and America. An average Israeli family consists of 3.4 people, with the average figure for Ashkenazim being 2.7 and for Oriental Jews 4.6.

Nearly 26 per cent of Oriental families consist of six

¹ *Ibid.*

² *Ibid.*

³ *The New York Times*, April 6, 1983.

⁴ *The New York Times*, April 7, 1983.

people. In other words, large families are typical for Jews of African and Asiatic background. They have serious difficulties with housing. As noted by Richard Mathews, "poor housing is one of the flashpoints of social unrest among Orientals in Israel. . . The diversity in standards of housing between the poor and affluent has led to sit-ins and antipathy to more recent immigrants, . . . who are given modern apartments right from the start."¹ This tactical move was meant to attract to Israel Jews from advanced capitalist states and socialist countries. But the Zionist leaders are doing nothing to eliminate large slum quarters in the bigger cities, where thousands of Jewish families of Oriental background find shelter. In Western Jerusalem, for example, such a quarter is called Catamon and, more commonly, an open-air labour exchange.

Poor quarters like Catamon in Jerusalem and Hatikvah and Kfar-Shalem in Tel-Aviv are officially called "distress neighbourhoods", which total 166 across the country.²

Discrimination against Oriental Jews in housing is more than obvious, judging by the following figures: only 14.4 per cent of the long-established settlers and 19.9 per cent of new immigrant European and American families had one room for two or more persons. The same figures for Asian and African families (45.3 and 55.8 per cent, respectively) indicate that the latter group lived in far more crowded homes.³

The housing problem is often a bone of contention, the spark that ignites ethnic resentments among Orientals and Ashkenazim. In December 1982, violent clashes occurred, for example, when Shimon Yehoshoua, a 26-year-old inhabitant of the Kfar-Shalem quarter in Tel-Aviv, aimed a pistol at policemen who had come to tear down a lean-to he had built beside his house. A policeman shot him to death. Mass demonstrations followed.

The Israeli leaders promised to close the gap between

¹ *The Middle East*, June 1977.

² *The New York Times*, April 7, 1983.

³ *Encyclopedia of Zionism and Israel*, ed. R. Patai, Herzl Press/McGraw-Hill, New York, 1971, p. 306.

the living standards of Western and Oriental Jews. But practically nothing is being done. Hardships in receiving an education and finding jobs, coupled with the pervasive feeling that they are inferior, have generated social anomalies, leading to crime, drug addiction, and prostitution. Israeli officials estimate, *Newsweek* reports, that Oriental Jews comprise more than 70 per cent of those living in slums, 80 per cent of unemployed teenagers, and 70 per cent of teenage prostitutes.¹ Meir Shitreet, Mayor of Yavne, admitted a few years ago that "there are 500,000 people in 166 distressed neighbourhoods living in poverty. Thousands of people are in jail as criminals, and thousands of children drop out before finishing high school." He amplified: "There is a loss of responsibility of the people. It is very serious".²

The charities note that present-day Israel has its own lumpenproletariat consisting of Jews hailing from Eastern countries. Take just these two figures: 90 per cent of convicted criminals are Sephardim, whereas 90 per cent of Knesset deputies are Ashkenazim. Crime has become a real blight. With population growth between 1950 and 1969 at 150 per cent, juvenile crime has gone up seven times over. Nor has there been a change for the better in the years that followed.

Israel's Zionist leaders maintain that equality of all citizens is "automatically assured" by service in the army. Having once had a taste of army life, people become "brothers". Doubly so, because in the Israeli army everybody eats out of the same bowl, anybody can get the desired education, or, if he has ability, become an officer, etc.³ But the facts do not confirm this, for only 20 per cent of the officers are Orientals.⁴

Israeli leaders suggest a policy of "dissolving", which would be tantamount to isolating communities of Oriental Jews in remote areas, and supplying cheap labour to so-

¹ *Newsweek*, April 19, 1971.

² *The New York Times*, April 7, 1983.

³ Simon H. Herman, *Israelis and Jews. The Continuity of an Identity*, Random House, New York, 1970, p. 128.

⁴ *The World Today*, April 1967.

called "developing" districts and towns, including occupied Arab territories.

Zionist attempts at solving the problem by various half-measures have proved a total failure. The essentially reactionary policy of the Zionists is at odds with their promises. In the early seventies, the problem grew more acute. Jews from the Middle East and Northern Africa formed a Black Panthers organisation as a socio-economic and partly political protest. In 1971, groups of "black" Jews (as Oriental Jews are sometimes named in Israel and the West), mainly young people, decided to join hands and fight for human rights and against communal discrimination.

The disaffection among Oriental Jews had been evident much earlier. In July 1959, and then in 1961, Jews from Northern Africa demonstrated in Wadi Salib, in the environs of Haifa. The unrest had caused Knesset to raise the issue of Oriental Jews, triggering sharp debates.¹

The Six Day War of 1967 had, for a time, pushed the problem of Oriental Jews to the background. Falling for the Zionist idea of "national unity" and "the common lot of all Jews", Kokhavi Shemesh, leader of the Oriental Jews, who had earlier criticised the government vigorously, said all Jews in Israel must close their ranks in what he termed the hour of danger. But that did not eliminate the problem. In the early 1970s, when the hysteria over the Six Day War had ended, and the euphoria subsided, Oriental Jews discovered that practically nothing had changed for them. And their movement for equality erupted with added force.

An interesting point is made by Elfi Pallis. "Since 1967," he writes, "many Oriental Jews escaped from poverty on the backs of the Palestinians. The small building contractors and workshop owners have benefited from cheap Arab labour, and many have taken advantage of their Arabic by finding well-paid jobs in the growing police and military complex. . . . The exploitation of the Palestinians is not in

¹ *Israel: Social Structure and Change*, ed. Michael Curtis, Mordecai S. Chertoff, Transaction Books, New Jersey, 1973, p. 326.

the long-term interest of Oriental Jews. When there was full employment, they gladly left the hard, dirty work to Arabs, but now that the Israeli economy is contracting, the two groups are beginning to compete for jobs. Not surprisingly, the non-unionised Palestinians who are in no position to demand index-linked wage increases are preferred by many Israeli employers.”¹

The arrest of leaders of Oriental Jews in the early 1970s when they requested permission to hold a demonstration in Jerusalem, generated considerable unrest. On March 3, 1971, hundreds of people gathered outside the municipal headquarters in Jerusalem, demanding release of the detained. Leaflets signed “Black Panthers” were distributed.

The Black Panthers organisation is not a mass party. It was never representative. In the 1973 election to the Knesset it polled a mere 13,332 votes or less than one per cent, and did not win a single seat. Yet the mere fact that it exists and that its platform provides for social equality, opposes exploitation, and calls for peace and friendship with the Arab nations—all this is an important factor in the Oriental Jews’ struggle for equality and against communal discrimination.

The Black Panthers have the support of Israel’s democratic forces opposing war and occupation, and campaigning for peace. The Israeli Communists see them as heralding the end of the period of the poor people’s reconciliation with their fate, and ushering in the beginning of their struggle for a better kind of life.² Meir Vilner, General Secretary of the Communist Party of Israel, emphasised the class essence of the problem of Oriental Jews in his report to the 17th Congress: “If the strife waged by the Oriental Jews becomes an integral part of the struggle of working people of all the communities and of the two peoples in the country which are exploited and deprived by the rulers and if they become united in their struggle—they will become an important factor in the just fight

¹ *Middle East International*, January 29, 1982.

² *Information Bulletin of the Communist Party of Israel*, Special number, 1972, p. 108.

for human conditions of life, for changing the face of Israeli society.”¹

Black Panther demonstrations continued throughout 1971. There were clashes with the police. The Israeli leaders tried, and still try, to portray them as lone roughnecks and criminal elements. But, as the Israeli Communists note, the Black Panthers are not a passing movement. “As long as there will be poverty and discrimination”, we read in the *Information Bulletin of the CPI*, “there will be a struggle against poverty and for rights”.²

The Black Panthers started as a movement of Oriental Jews for equality. But in due course, at least a part of its members began to oppose various aspects of the home and foreign policy of the ruling Zionist elite. In December 1971, Kokhavi Shemesh noted that Israel’s government was protecting the interests only of the ruling class and the big capitalists, while totally ignoring the common people.³

The Black Panthers, though unquestionably progressive, have split up because of the diversity of the membership and lack of a clear-cut class standpoint on Israel’s problems. A pro-Zionist group, the so-called White-and-Blue Panthers, has hived off from them. It supports and seeks conciliation with the government. This is reflected in the way it calls itself, taking its name from the colours of the flag of Israel and the World Zionist Organisation. And obviously, the split has weakened the Black Panthers.

On the other hand, some of the Black Panthers have a clearer understanding of the true reasons for communal discrimination, and a clearer idea of what they are fighting for. Seeing that their small numbers, the amorphous state of their organisation, and its lack of influence among the masses make achievement of their aims on their own impossible, they have begun cooperating with the Communist Party of Israel, notably within the Histadruth. Their leaders

¹ *Information Bulletin of the Communist Party of Israel*, Special number, 1972, p. 108.

² *Information Bulletin of the Communist Party of Israel*, No. 5, 1971, p. 21.

³ See *Ibid.*, No. 9, 1971, p. 36.

reacted favourably to the following statement of the 18th Congress of the CPI:

"The Communist Party of Israel, which unites within its ranks Jews and Arabs, members of all communities, on a basis of equality, appreciation and mutual respect, gives a live example of the road to the solution of these problems and to the struggle for reaching these goals. It is ready to cooperate with the organisation of the Black Panthers and with every other organisation prepared to struggle against the prevailing policy of fostering poverty for the many and riches for the few, of maintaining communal and national discrimination; it is ready to co-operate with any factor prepared to struggle for social progress, for equality of rights, for peace."¹

This statement is fully relevant, important, and valid today.

The Democratic Front for Peace and Equality was formed in March 1977, encompassing the Communist Party of Israel, progressive organisations of Oriental Jews, the Black Panthers, and other democratic groups in the country, and took part in the 1977 Knesset elections with an agreed common programme.

Today, the Black Panthers make the most of parliamentary channels and other forms for exposing the anti-people policy of Israel's rulers. They stress that Oriental Jews must fight against the domination of exploiters, communal discrimination and national oppression, and not against Ashkenazim or Arabs.

The Black Panthers have not won the response they deserve, because people in the country are constantly bombarded by blatant Zionist and chauvinist propaganda. The leading political forces in present-day Israel—the Likud, which is a bloc of rightist bourgeois parties, and the Social-Zionist Labour Party—are not loosening their grip on the Oriental Jewish electorate, and go out of their way to win over immigrants from Asia and Africa. Most Oriental Jews fail to see the true reasons for their misery, and

¹ *Information Bulletin of the Communist Party of Israel*, No. 9-10, 1976, p. 110.

the social roots of inequality and discrimination. Their political thinking is astonishingly shortsighted, and unable to rise above the two-party alternative: either the Likud or the Labour Party.

At one time, Oriental Jews considered it their "duty" to vote for the Labour Party. But the 1977 elections, in which the Likud bloc came to power, were a turning point in their political orientation. Switching their allegiance from the Labour Party to the Likud bloc, Oriental Jews thereby demonstrated "their anger, disappointment and frustration over the Labour 'establishment's' failure to integrate them fairly into the new society." They chose Begin, another Ashkenazi, reports David Lennon, a British journalist, "not because of his ethnic background, but because he was the only opposition choice they had."¹

In the 1981 elections, as many as 57 per cent of Oriental Jews voted for Begin's Likud bloc, and another 18 per cent for other parties in Likud's coalition. Nor did the situation change in the 1984 elections. The great majority of Oriental Jews, 73 per cent, preferred Likud, while 70 per cent of the Ashkenazim voted for the Labour Party.²

For a number of reasons Likud propaganda fell on fertile soil among Oriental Jews. One reason is that Likud has been fairly skilful in generating sentiment among them against the Labour Party. The rightists never failed to remind Oriental Jews of the "humiliations and discrimination" they had suffered in the nearly thirty years of Labour Party rule.³ But that does not mean the situation of Oriental Jews has improved under the Likud. For one thing, the number of Oriental Jews living below the poverty line has doubled. But a psychological inertia, when the Labour Party is seen as the only alternative to Likud, has given the rightist party most of the votes of Oriental Jews.

The situation is not immutable, however. The government of so-called national unity, consisting of the Likud bloc and the Labour Party, which came to power in the

¹ *Middle East International*, January 21, 1983.

² *Le Monde diplomatique*, septembre 1984.

³ *Ibid.*

1984 elections, had demonstrated ideological and political unity, and shown that the difference between these Zionist groups is irrelevant. It is likely that a sense of political indefiniteness or, perhaps, apathy will arise among Oriental Jews. They are sure to want a third power that would, at last, protect their interests. A tendency in that direction has already surfaced at the latest Knesset elections when the Orthodox Agudat Israel party split up, and a new religious organisation of Sephardim worshipping the Torah, the Shas, came into being. French observer Amnon Kape-liouk noted in *Le Monde diplomatique* that if there had been any surprise at these elections, it was that Shas had won four seats—a success which only goes to show that the Sephardim in Israel have woken up.¹

All the same, only the future will show how clearly the Sephardim are aware to the situation. The anti-Arab sentiment reigning among the mass of Oriental Jews is a grave obstacle. This sentiment is fanned and encouraged by the Likud. It will be recalled that most Oriental Jews have come from Arab countries owing to the anti-Jewish feelings there, provoked by Zionist agents and the actions of Israeli armed forces and Zionists against Palestinian Arabs. This shows why, as a rule, Oriental Jews are more aggressively hostile to Arabs than Western Jews. French journalist Jacques Coubard is quite right when he says that “in most cases allegiance to the community of Oriental Jews only tends to keep down political consciousness.”²

Likud is exploiting the political ignorance of Oriental Jews to propagate anti-Arab ideas. Benjamin Gonen, who represents the Democratic Front for Peace and Equality in the Histadruth, has portrayed the Zionist tactics in the following terms: “Begin has managed to inspire Oriental Jews with the idea that there is someone lower than them—the Arabs, and that everything is the fault of the Arabs. This is dangerous, and shows how closely peace, social progress and equality interweave.”³

Exploiting the hardships of Oriental Jews and channeling

¹ *Le Monde diplomatique*, septembre 1984.

² *Cahiers du Communisme*, septembre 1977.

³ *La Vie ouvrière*, june 27, 1983.

their disaffection above all against Arabs, who are portrayed as the culprits for Israel's enormous military spending, rising prices, and other ills, the Likud leaders make the most of the anti-Arab sentiment in their fight for power. True, the anti-Arabism of the Social-Zionists is just as virile. But the rightist parties emphasise the Social-Zionists' inability to oppose the Arabs.

The Likud promises Oriental Jews various "political opportunities". But this is done in small doses, so that the Labour Party might be accused of impinging on the political rights of Oriental Jews, on the one hand, while keeping down their presence in the Likud leadership, in the Knesset, and so on, on the other. With the result that under the Labour government (before the 1977 elections) there were 20 Oriental Jews in the Knesset, their number rising to 22 in the 1977 elections, to 27 in the 1981 elections, and to 32 in the 1984 elections.¹

The trump card in Likud's game is that the President of Israel, Yitzhak Navon, comes from a family of Oriental Jews.

All this propaganda game of the Zionists is meant to conceal the inability, and indeed reluctance, to resolve the problem of Oriental Jews. The Oriental Jews pinned great hopes on the Likud bloc in 1977. But their hopes were in vain. Nor is there any reason to expect the present "national unity" government to solve their problems. The growing military expenditures, the 400-per cent inflation, and curtailed social spending—all this falls heaviest on the shoulders of the working people, the Arab national minority, and the poorest segment of the Jewish population, that of Oriental Jews. As far back as 1978, the British journal *The Middle East* predicted that "the hostility between Sephardi and Ashkenazi communities is almost certain to be exacerbated by the economic measures . . . of Begin's new economic policy".²

It is still too early to speak of any rapid development of class consciousness among Oriental Jews. The fanning

¹ *Le Monde diplomatique*, septembre 1984.

² *The Middle East*, February 1978.

of militarist sentiment and manipulation of economic levers is helping the right-wing parties to exercise pressure, although, as we have earlier noted, it is very likely that many Oriental Jews will in due course turn their backs on politics. With the Zionist parties refusing to settle their social problems and to eliminate discrimination, the importance has increased of the activity of the Communist Party of Israel and all other democratic forces, which have such a programme and want to lead the mass of Oriental Jews, to unite all the working people, in combating the anti-people policy of the Zionist rulers.

The class struggle in Israel depends largely on how fairly the Mid-East conflict is settled. There is a close link between the country's labour movement, the movement for peace, the issue of inequality (including communal discrimination), halting the state of war with the neighbouring Arab countries, and cuts in military expenditure. That is why it is essential, in the opinion of Israeli Communists, to see to it that the mass of the working people still under the political influence of Zionist and chauvinist propaganda, should finally realise that expansionism is the main reason behind their suffering, and that they must secure a change of policy and put an end to the offensive on the living standard and on social rights.

A fair peace in the interests of all the peoples and countries in the region will create favourable conditions for the Israeli workers' struggle for their rights and interests, for closer cohesion within Israel's working class in the struggle against the ruling Zionist elite.

E. Dmitriev

MALIGNERS OF MARXISM

Imperialism has always used its offspring, Zionism, as an anti-communist and anti-Soviet tool. Hatred of world socialism, of the international communist and working-class movement, and action against the national liberation struggle of the developing countries, above all in the Arab world—all this has, in effect, become a built-in part of the activity of Zionist organisations, those in the Western countries, notably the USA, and those that pass themselves off as international.

There is yet another ugly aspect to Zionist propaganda and activity—that of ascribing anti-Semitism to Marxism, and of declaring as anti-Semitic any exposure by Marxist scholars of the unscientific ideological Zionist postulates, theoretical constructions and undisguisedly pro-imperialist practices, thereby equating anti-Zionism and anti-Semitism.

This is no novelty. But of late the ploy is being used more vigorously. Zionists of all hues combine it with attempts to distort the Marxist-Leninist attitude to the Jewish question, and malign the nationalities policy of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. This is prompted by the wish to pretend that anti-Semitism is everlasting, and that Jews of all the world have the same interests irrespective of where they happen to reside. Ex-Premier Begin, who justified Zionist interference in the internal affairs of other countries on the pretext of combating anti-Semitism, said “anti-Semitism and its consequences are no longer an internal affair (of other countries) . . . and we assert the right to intervene to protect Jews wherever they are”.¹

¹ *International Herald Tribune*, August 21-22, 1982.

On this pretext, Zionists use Soviet press reports of Jews, among others, being condemned for criminal offences or profiteering, or for activity hostile to the socialist system, as tokens of anti-Semitism. They accuse the Soviet Union of state-sponsored anti-Semitism and draw the conclusion that socialism inevitably breeds anti-Semitism.

Zionists maintain that anti-Semitism is a built-in feature of the socialist doctrine. Like imperialist propaganda, they equate socialist countries with nazi regimes, declaring that both are totalitarian and both anti-Semitic.

More, Zionists look for the roots of anti-Semitism in the works of Marx, Engels and Lenin. Publications of various Zionist organisations allege that what they call Marx's anti-Semitism was the source of anti-Semitism among his followers all over the world. Philosophers who had influenced Marx's political views are also accused of anti-Semitism. Fourier, Voltaire, the French encyclopaedists, and the Young Hegelians, we are told, had contributed to the "anti-Jewish ideology" and inevitably influenced Marx as philosopher.

The Zionists attack Hegel and Feuerbach most of all, because those two philosophers referred critically to Judaic dogmas which, in a politicised form, as we know, are one of the pillars of Zionism. "Marx considered Hegel the master of philosophic thought," writes *Midstream*, a Zionist journal. "Marx's anti-Jewishness seems to be taken right from Hegel. A no less inimical evaluation of Judaism was given by the German thinker, Ludwig Feuerbach, with whom Marx occasionally polemicised but who influenced him greatly."¹

On the other hand, the Zionists maintain with a straight face that all the positive elements in Marxism have their roots in Judaism, to which, they allege, Marx had willy-nilly gravitated because he had "felt himself a Jew".

"One dare not deny," *Midstream* maintains, "that many of Marx's intentions, especially his passionate call to create a new and just social order, are rooted in the historic Jewish stormy revolt against wickedness and oppression."²

¹ *Midstream*, December 1983.

² *Ibid.*

The Zionists try to project Marx's anti-Semitism out of his Jewish background, and separate Marx the Jew from Marx the revolutionary in philosophy and practice. "Of all the reasons underlying Marx's hatred of Jews and Judaism," the aforementioned journal claims, "it seems that the most crucial was a tormenting inferiority complex because of his Jewish ancestry."¹

Lastly, Zionists maintain that Marx himself had originated the theory of a world conspiracy, which, as the Zionists would have us believe, he had considered to have been initiated, inspired, and orchestrated by Jews. "It was Marx's sinister achievement," we read in *Commentary*, a pro-Zionist American journal, "to marry the economic anti-Semitism of the French socialists to the philosophical anti-Semitism of the German idealists and so to construct a new kind of anti-Semitic conspiracy theory which was to be an intellectual rehearsal for his general theory of capital.... Marx gave to the burden of anti-Semitic fantasy a whole new lease on life, and new, respectable garments of pseudorationality, calculated to appeal to the young of successive generations."²

All this rubbish, made to sound scientific, is meant to pursue two distinctly visualised aims. The first is to turn against Marxism those Jews who address themselves to it for answers to vital issues, who think that Marxism can help humanity find the road of true freedom and genuine democracy. The other purpose is to fan anti-Semitic sentiment among intellectuals in capitalist countries, where people are looking agonisingly for an explanation of the complications and conflicts that are hounding humanity through the fault of imperialism.

The bourgeois philosophical schools of our time, just as at the time of Marx, are trying merely to explain the world in their own way, giving no thought to the need for changing it or, perhaps, banishing that thought deliberately. This sets off Marx's doctrine in all its greatness. As Lenin described it, it is "all-powerful because it is correct".

¹ *Midstream*, December 1983.

² *Commentary* April 1984.

Hence the fury of all critics of Marxism, including Zionists. Hence their ceaseless maligning of Marxism, or their claims that it takes its origins in the sacred writings and that of all things, many of its principles were borrowed from the Pentateuch or Torah.

Zionists do not bother to look for corroborating arguments. They maintain out of hand that Marxism had, at all times, bred anti-Semitism and anti-Jewish sentiment. By definition, they maintain that anti-Semitism is a built-in element of life in socialist countries. They go even further. They portray anti-Semitism, "that is despicable attempt . . . to exacerbate racial particularism and national enmity"¹ as Lenin described it, as one of the main features of the nationalities policy in the socialist countries, and notably the Soviet Union.

They maintain, among other things, that owing to the nationalities policy of the CPSU, Jewishness as such is vanishing in the Soviet Union, and that the refusal to grant the Jews "national cultural autonomy" (promoted by Zionists who preach the existence of a worldwide Jewish nation possessing singular features) is evidence of the anti-Jewish nature of the Soviet nationalities policy not only inside the country but also on the world scale. Here, too, the Zionists go against the facts. They quote Lenin's pronouncements on the unscientific and politically harmful nature of the idea of a "single Jewish nation", and his criticism of the Jewish Bund, which set Jewish proletarians apart from the mass of proletarians in Russia, and thereby try to prove the identity of the Jewish ethnic group with Zionism, drawing the conclusion that anti-Zionism and anti-Semitism are one and the same thing. Zionists refer to a "state anti-Semitism" in the Soviet Union. They accuse the Soviet Union of breaching the Helsinki accords. US Congressman Leach declared without rhyme or reason that anti-Semitism in the Soviet Union "begins at school".

"Teachers readily countenance fights and cruel games of ridicule," he claims, and refers to a "concentration

¹ V. I. Lenin, "Second Congress of the R.S.D.L.P.", *Collected Works*, Vol. 6, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1977, p. 468.

camp” game, whose rules are simple: “Jewish children are given a number by which they are referred to that day instead of by name.”¹ The congressman has obviously mixed up his facts. Such games might be played in America, but certainly not in the Soviet Union.

Zionists also maintain that the role of the “negative stereotype” of Jews in people’s minds has increased considerably these days. Yet that is obviously one more propaganda trick, this insistence that the “Jewish problem” is at the centre of all ideological, political, intellectual, and other problems of our time. They adduce, in fact, that this phony problem is far more important to the society where Jews live than all the other sociological problems put together. Again, this is meant to show, if indirectly, the “exclusiveness” of Jews. There you have Zionist chauvinism and racism in their pure form, no matter how fervently Zionists may deny them.

Zionists with their perverse logic go out of their way to prove the identity of anti-Semitism and anti-Zionism. Hebrew University professor Sh. Ettinger writes that “anti-Zionism is a direct historical and psychological extension of anti-Semitism”.² Though Zionist “logic” may look convincing on the face of it a closer examination shows what shaky ground all Zionist arguments and conclusions are constructed upon. US Zionist Wieseltir tries to prove that anti-Semitism and anti-Zionism stand for the same thing. The former is equivalent to the latter in theory, he says, because the legitimate historical community in the modern world is the nation. According to the principles of our time, he adds, each nation has the right to statehood; consequently, those bereft of the right to statehood are not a nation. Anti-Zionism, he amplifies, is denial of the Jewish right to statehood. It is therefore a denial of the status of Jews as a nation. And that, in turn, is a denial of the historically legitimate existence of Jews. Anti-Zionism, he concludes, expels Jews from the midst of people

¹ *Congressional Record*, Vol. 129, Washington, November 17, 1983, No. 160.

² *The Jerusalem Quarterly*, Spring, 1982, No. 23, p. 99.

deserving of respect, thus preparing the ground for fresh anti-Semitic violence.¹

It is easy to see that Wieseltir's construction is legerdemain pure and simple. To begin with, it is not right to refer to a single Jewish nation. Even the emergent Israeli nation, as many Israeli scholars and politicians admit, is not single. There are no valid grounds for saying, for example, that an Argentinian Jew has the same psychology, culture, and the like, as the French Jew. The Yemeni Jew has practically nothing in common with an American Jew. And so on. Second, no one denies the State of Israel its right to existence in a setting of peace and good relations with its Arab neighbours. Zionism is what dooms the people of Israel to endless hostility with the Arabs. Zionist theorists and politicians tell the plain Israelis that Israel can survive in the "permanently hostile environment" only through continuous struggle with the Arabs. They have no intention of looking into the reasons for this hostile environment. It is far simpler for them to blame it on the "national traits" of Arabs, who, they allege, are organically intolerant of Jews. Third, no one has ever denied the "historically legitimate existence of Jews", as Wieseltir would have us believe.

The propaganda thrust of Wieseltir's construction is the following: he wants every Israeli to conclude that the existence of Palestinian Arabs is unlawful, that they have no right to an Arab Palestinian state inasmuch as Palestinians are dispersed all over the world. The Zionists and their patrons are, indeed, doing their utmost to prevent the emergence of an Arab Palestinian state. That is the underlying purpose of Wieseltir's quasi-logical construction. But there is yet another purpose. Again Zionists are trying to incite anti-Jewish sentiment among non-Jews. That is an old trick used in his time by Theodor Herzl. It is essential if there is to be any stepped-up Jewish immigration to Israel. Wieseltir's constructions are, thus, in much the same spirit as the utterances of Sharun, editor of *Davar*, an Israeli newspaper, who had at one time suggested form-

¹ See *Jewish Chronicle*, November 12, 1982.

ing special groups of vigorous young Jews to boost Jewish emigration to Israel by undercover methods. Alfred M. Lilienthal, an American Jew and anti-Zionist, cites the following utterance of Sharun in his book: "The task of these young men would be to disguise themselves as non-Jews, and plague Jews with anti-Semitic slogans, such as 'Bloody Jew', 'Jews go to Palestine', and similar Intimacies! I can vouch that the results in terms of a considerable immigration to Israel from these countries would be ten thousand times larger than the results brought by thousands of emissaries who had been preaching for decades to deaf ears."¹

The Zionist attacks on "Marxist anti-Semitism" have their origin above all in the "social objectives" which imperialism, master and patron, sets Zionism in the ideological field: to help pry away from Marxist ideas those persons and political groups which are still searching for their ideological platform. There are such groups among the Jewish population in various capitalist countries, Israel included.

Imperialism and Zionism favour what they term deideologised political organisations "equidistant" from the two world systems, because, sooner or later, the West expects to win them to their side by its outward scorn for political matters and by the "supraclass" nature of its concepts. Hence the already repeatedly refuted political ploy of passing Zionism off as an ideology of "national liberation of the Jewish people".

It is common knowledge that Zionism, its political practice as well as its ideology, is shot through with the man-hating concept of Jewish superiority over non-Jews. Zionists attack Marxism, too, as an ideology of non-Jews with which Jews can have nothing in common.

Marxism has overcome countless difficulties and obstacles in the past. These days, the Marxist-Leninist ideology is showing the way to many hundreds of millions of working

¹ Alfred M. Lilienthal, *The Other Side of the Coin. An American Perspective of the Arab-Israeli Conflict*, Devin-Adair Company, New York, 1965, p. 47.

people on all continents. Again and again, critics of Marxism have foundered. Their attempts to refute Marxism failed invariably. Nor will the Zionist critics of Marxism ever attain success, for with every passing day Marxism is reasserting its vital force and sweeping Zionist dogmas out of the way. For Marxists, daily struggle against the ideology and practice of present-day Zionism is a means of exposing the hostile imperialist ideology which is trying to poison the mass of the people with the venom of racism and chauvinism. The anti-Marxist artifices of the Zionists are sure to go up in smoke, while Marxism will continue its triumphant march across the planet. That is the writing on the wall, the direction of history's progressive development.

L. Jacobson

**THE ANTI-COMMUNIST
ESSENCE
OF INTERNATIONAL
ZIONISM**

Ever since it came into the world at the end of the 19th century, Zionism has been a tool of imperialism. And with every fresh aggravation of the general crisis of capitalism, Zionism—the ideology and political practice of the big Jewish bourgeoisie—is becoming ever more reactionary. The process flows from the essence of Zionism as imperialism's henchman. That is something no propaganda tricks and no tactical manoeuvres are able to disguise.

The imperialists make extensive and diverse use of Zionist organisations (and the potential of the State of Israel since it was formed in May 1948) to combat revolutionary and democratic forces. The Zionists, for their part, draw on imperialist help in carrying out their aims in the Middle East, in establishing ideological, political and organisational control over Jews in various countries, and in buttressing the position of major Jewish capitalists in the economic and political affairs of various capitalist states.

International Zionism occupies a prominent place in the imperialist system. It is invariably active against the Soviet Union and other socialist countries, and against the world communist, working-class, and national liberation movements. Zionism's ideology and political practice is chauvinist, racist, and anti-communist to the extreme.

Zionism holds a special place in world reaction's anti-communist and anti-Soviet subversive activities. Thanks to its so-called pluralism (with several political organisations operating within the Zionist framework), Zionism conducts anti-communist and anti-Soviet acts of ideological diversion along a broad front. Bourgeois Zionist parties of fascist,

pro-fascist, conservative, and relatively liberal varieties, collaborate on an anti-communist and anti-Soviet basis with many related international and national organisations.

The religious Zionists and their allies, the Judaic clericals affiliated with various inter-confessional and confessional associations, are a detachment of clerical anti-communism. The Histadruth, the Zionist-directed Israeli trade-union centre, conducts pro-Zionist and anti-communist activities in the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions and in trade-union centres of specific capitalist countries. It is also doing its utmost to establish contacts and gain influence in the trade-union movement of some developing countries.

Zionist parties and organisations have a distinct "division of labour" in carrying out Zionism's strategic course. The social-Zionist Labour Party of Israel, MAI, which had been the main party in the government coalition from 1948 to 1977, and which again joined the government in September 1984, follows the aforesaid political and ideological line within the Socialist International and in its dealings with social-democratic parties. The Labour Party and the so-called World Labour Zionist Movement (an organisation associated with the Socialist International and active in 22 capitalist countries in addition to Israel) is eager to win social-democratic support for Zionism and the policy of the Israeli rulers. The social-Zionists, who are on the extreme right wing of the Socialist International, are doing their utmost (with the help of their allies in social-democratic parties, reformist unions, and liberal bourgeois groups) to incite anti-communism and anti-Sovietism. They jump at every opportunity to carry out subversive actions against the world communist movement and other progressive forces.

The pro-Zionist and anti-communist processing of those who are to the left of the Socialist International, including the New Left, is conducted by Mapam,¹ the Zionist United Workers' Party of Israel (it was in the government for

¹ At the 16th Congress of the Socialist International (April 1984), Mapam, which had had merely consultative status, was admitted as a member of that organisation.

many years and is therefore totally responsible for its policy) and its branches in 16 countries. "As a Zionist ideological section belonging to the left wing," says a Zionist publication, "it managed to make contact with non-affiliated Jews and also with those who despaired of communism, have left the New Left and the old, or had been expelled from other liberation movements and thus came to us—to Zionism."¹

* * *

The Zionists declared their hostility towards scientific socialism the moment they stepped into the political arena. Theodor Herzl, the founder of Zionism, wrote: "Our young people must back away from their socialist tendencies and come over to me."² The Zionist document adopted back in 1898, stressed that Zionism and socialism were two mutually repelling poles and ruled out each other.

Later, it is true, Zionism's petty-bourgeois wing formed a number of quasi-socialist parties, whose successors have survived to this day. Ever since 1930, they were dominant within the Jewish community of Palestine, and constituted the backbone of the government coalitions that ruled Israel from 1948 to 1977. For a number of years they were predominant, too, in the World Zionist Organisation, and have been no less virulently anti-communist and anti-Soviet than the undisguisedly bourgeois Zionist parties.

After the October Revolution of 1917 in Russia a segment of left Zionists called for "unification of workers' Zionism with communism" and professed to be Communists. Leaders of the so-called Jewish Communist Party (Poale Zion), formed in August 1919, swore "loyalty" to communism, proletarian revolution, and Soviet power.

¹ *Survey of the Activities of the Zionist Parties and WZO. January 1968-September 1971*, published by the Organisation and Information Department of the Zionist Executive, Jerusalem, 1972, p. 35.

² Quoted from M. Lurieh, *Herzлизм и трудовой сионизм*, (Herzлизм and Labour Zionism) Hitahdut Publishers, Berlin, 1924, p. 40.

Under this cover, they were active among Jews in Soviet Russia and some other countries, neutralising Marxist criticism of Zionism, and persuading Jewish workers and artisans to settle in Palestine and, as they put it, start a "class struggle" and "preparations for socialist revolution" there. They declared themselves internationalists—with no legitimate grounds, of course, and claimed loyalty to the dictatorship of the proletariat, going out of their way to prevail on the Comintern and its sections to back the "Palestinian idea".

The world communist movement saw through the reactionary, nationalist essence of the JCP (Poale Zion). The pro-imperialist essence of Zionism, in whatever guise, and the disruptive activity of left Zionists in the international working-class movement were examined at the Second Congress of the Communist International in the summer of 1920. Its resolution on the national and colonial question, which Lenin had helped to draft, said: "A clear example of how the working masses of oppressed nations are deceived by the joint efforts of Entente imperialism and the bourgeoisie of the nation in question, is the Palestinian undertaking of the Zionists, and Zionism in general, which, under guise of establishing a Jewish state in Palestine, has abandoned the working Arab population of Palestine, in which working Jews are but an insignificant minority, to British exploitation."

Zionist attempts to penetrate the communist movement failed. After the Third Congress of the Comintern (in the summer of 1921), the Comintern Executive and the fraternal parties set about exposing the JCP once and for all, whatever guise it assumed and whatever its tactical manoeuvres. By that time painstaking educational work of Communists among Jewish working people who had fallen for the JCP demagoguery, saw an ever greater number of JCP members turning against their leaders, resigning, from the JCP, and taking up truly communist positions. In December 1922, the JCP in the Soviet republics dissolved itself, with most of its members joining the Communist Party. But some joined right-wing Zionist organisations, and continued their anti-communist activities. The same

was true in other countries where JCP organisations existed.

In Palestine, internationalist Communists resisted the attempts of former Poale Zion members to inject nationalist ideas in the young Communist Party. This lasted from 1919 until early 1924. But in the years that followed, the world communist movement had had to fight off the attacks not only of candidly bourgeois Zionists and Zionists masked as Social-Democrats, but also, all too often, the left-wing social-Zionists, who declared themselves Marxists and sought to infiltrate Communist parties.

* * *

The imperialists expected Zionists to distract Jewish people in Russia and other countries, above all in Eastern Europe, from supporting Communist parties. They hoped to isolate the Jewry from the revolutionary struggle of the mass of the people of all nationalities by directing their aspirations and energy to the Zionist quasi-solution of the Jewish question. That is why, in a bid, among other things, to buttress its positions in Palestine, the British government—the Zionists' chief patron between the two world wars—published the Balfour Declaration on November 2, 1917.

Acting on their traditional divide-and-rule principle, the British promised to help establish a Jewish national home in Arab-populated Palestine.

The imperialists' and Zionists' tactical manoeuvre, however, yielded no results. It only betrayed their political shortsightedness. "Russia is following Lenin," the journal *Rassvet*, central organ of the Zionist organisation in Russia, lamented on November 14, 1917. "We did not want that; what is more, we fought against it."

Zionists were hostile to the Great October Socialist Revolution from the word go. They supported the bourgeois Provisional Government, and later the Constituent Assembly, and were thereupon active in the counter-revolution and the foreign intervention against the young Soviet Republic, against the Bolshevik Party. Along with other anti-Soviet organisations the Zionists (and this included their left wing) flung mud on the Soviet land and the Com-

munists. Zionist writer A. Davidson maintained that "in Russian politics, socialism cannot be a constructive force. At most, a socialist government is tolerable as a transitional phase, provided it does not last long and operates under the supervision of more skillful people".

The Poale Zion, which professed to be a socialist party, described Soviet Russia as a "typical police state" and portrayed Soviet policy, directed to securing true, not merely formal, equal rights for Jews, and to protecting the interests of Jews, as a "revival of the regime of Jewish oppression".

Lenin, the Bolsheviks, and the world communist movement, were consistently opposed to any and all reactionary nationalism, chauvinism, and racism. Then and now, Marxists-Leninists oppose anti-Semitism as well as Zionism.

Failing to win mass support among the Jewry in Soviet Russia, Zionism there suffered complete ideological and political failure. Like other anti-Sovieteers, the Zionists reacted by mounting subversive activities against the world's first socialist state. One Zionist leader, D. Pasmanik, previously a Constitutional Democrat, a follower of Wrangel during the Civil War in Russia, and later a white emigré, wrote with malice in 1924: "We Zionists must do our utmost to set up a unified anti-Bolshevik front with one single aim—to overthrow the Bolsheviks."¹ As far back as the 1920s, Zionists and their allies spoke slanderously of "defending Jews against Soviet anti-Semitism and insisted that anti-Zionism and anti-Semitism were synonymous. Zionist leaders even went so far as to declare Soviet power the "chief enemy of the Jews".²

"Those who want to serve Zionism must combat communism at every step," Zionist leader Vladimir Jabotinsky wrote in 1933. "Because any advantage that communism may gain—in Asia, Africa or the edge of the world—is a

¹ *Rossiia i yevreii* (Russia and the Jews), Issue 1, Osnova Publishers, Berlin, 1924, p. 225.

² See inter alia D. S. Pasmanik, *Russkaya revoliutsia i yevreistvo* (Bolshevism i Judaism) [The Russian Revolution and the Jewry], Berlin, 1923, pp. 12, 203-204, etc.

substantial loss for the building of a Jewish Palestine. Conversely, communism's every setback is tantamount to Zionism's substantial gain."

Jabotinsky had no compunctions about showing why Zionists hated communism. "Communism," he, who was hailed by his followers as the Jewish Mussolini, wrote, "is out to destroy the only source of our constructive capital, the Jewish bourgeoisie. Its essence is our lifeblood, whereas the principle of communism is class struggle against the bourgeoisie."¹ Jabotinsky was infuriated by the support that Communists offered national liberation movements. For example, he wrote: "Communism incites and intends to continue to incite the Eastern peoples, and can do it only in the name of national freedom. It tells them and will continue to tell them: your land belongs to you, not to any foreigners. That is how it intends to speak to Arabs in general, and to the Arabs of Palestine in particular. . . . For our Zionist lungs, communism is poison gas, and you, Zionists, must treat it accordingly."²

The imperialists have long since accepted Zionism as an ally in their fight against communism. Winston Churchill, for example, wrote in 1920 that he considered Zionism the answer to international communism and that it should "win the soul of the Jewish people".³

The 17th Congress of the Communist Party of Israel (June, 1972) stressed that ever since the October Revolution, Zionists in Russia had conducted subversive activities against the socialist system in a bid to pry away working Jews from the working people of other nationalities. This was also true of all other socialist countries, it said. "The most important service to imperialism in its struggle against communism," the Congress pointed out in a resolution, "is given by the Zionist organisations in the sphere of incitement activities and subversion against the Soviet Union".⁴

¹ Quoted from *Rachim*, No. 6, 1977, p. 29.

² *Hadar*, February 1941, p. 33.

³ Quoted from Terence Prittie, *Eshkol: The Man and the Nation*, Pitman Publishing Corporation, New York, 1969, p. 25.

⁴ *Information Bulletin of the Communist Party of Israel*, Special 17th Congress issue, Tel Aviv.

In recent years, international Zionism's anti-communist and anti-Soviet ideological and political acts of diversion have attained unprecedented dimensions. No slander, no malice, no insinuation is too foul if it is addressed against the Soviet social and political system, against the policy of the CPSU, the Soviet government, and the world communist movement.

There may be differences, even outright struggle, between Zionist centres, parties and leaders over particular questions of policy and tactics. Yet anti-communism and anti-Sovietism is common to all Zionist currents and organisations—from candidly fascist and pro-fascist to "left". The entire highly ramified propaganda machine of the main Zionist centres—the World Zionist Organisation, the Jewish Agency for Israel, and the World Jewish Congress—is completely immersed in "psychological warfare". Such formally non-Zionist organisations as B'nai B'rith, the American Jewish Committee, the American Jewish Congress, the American Jewish Forum, the Universal Israelite Alliance (with headquarters in Paris), the Board of Deputies of British Jews, the South African Jewish Board of Deputies, the Hebrew Immigrant Aid Society, and others, follow what are in substance the same principles. Zionist and pro-Zionist organisations are these days active in as many as seventy countries.

Under Zionist rule, Israel has long since become a centre of anti-communism and anti-Sovietism. "Anti-Sovietism," Meir Vilner, General Secretary of the Communist Party of Israel, pointed out, "is the most terrible poison in our country, more terrible than anti-Arab chauvinism and militarism. This is reaction's main weapon against socialism and peace."¹

Blatant anti-Soviet and anti-communist propaganda is conducted in Israel round the clock. "Politically," US Zionist Mark Braverman writes, "Israel clearly would fit in with the Western bloc. Her main enemy is the Soviet Union. Her leaders are strongly anti-communist."²

¹ *World Marxist Review*, April 1979, p. 4.

² *The New Jews*, ed. by James A. Sleeper and Alan L. Mittz, Vintage Books, New York, 1971, p. 81.

The rulers in Tel Aviv do not hesitate to falsify the facts about the Soviet Union's attitude to the State of Israel, about the Israeli-Arab conflict, and a peaceful settlement in the Middle East. The rising generation of Israelis is being brought up in a distinctly anti-Soviet spirit. Young Israelis are told that the Soviet Union is an enemy of Israel, of the Israeli people, and that it conducts an anti-Semitic policy.

A string of generously financed propaganda centres and "research" institutions are active in Israel, alongside many governmental bodies and local branches of international Zionist centres. They include, among others, the National Council in Defense of Soviet Jews, the Union of Jews from the USSR, the Academic Committee on Soviet Jewry, the Information Centre on Soviet Jewry, and so on.

Most prominent among the nearly 30 Israeli "research" institutes specialising in anti-communism and anti-Sovietism, are the Centre for Soviet and East European Research of the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, the Institute for Soviet and East European Studies of Tel Aviv University, the Centre for Strategic Studies of Tel Aviv University, the International Centre for the Study of Anti-Semitism of Hebrew University, the Jad Vashem Remembrance Authority, the Jonathan's Institute on International Terrorism in Jerusalem, and the Israel Research Institute of Contemporary Society.

An Agency of News from Eastern Europe, whose output is extensively used by the US Information Agency, the subversive Liberty and Free Europe radio stations, and a number of reactionary publications in the West, was founded in Israel in 1956. In February 1985, Israeli Prime Minister Shimon Peres let US President Ronald Reagan know that the USA had his consent to build a powerful Voice of America transmitter in Israel to escalate slander broadcasts to the Soviet Union and other countries of the socialist community. A month later, Tel Aviv consented to relay Radio Liberty and Radio Free Europe broadcasts to Eastern Europe.

The anti-Soviet and anti-communist propaganda conducted in Israel and by international, regional, and "natio-

nal” Zionist centres, and their various special organs, is aimed at escalating psychological warfare against the Soviet Union, the other socialist countries, and the world communist movement. These firebrand organs, whose number is mounting continuously, include the Permanent Leadership of the International Conference of Solidarity with Soviet Jewry (formed in 1978 by the 29th Congress of the World Zionist Organisation), the Prisoners of Zion Commission, the Jewish Conference in Defence of Soviet Jews, the Institute of Jewish Affairs (with headquarters in London), and so on, and so forth.

Dozens of large and hundreds of small Zionist organisations specialising in slander against the socialist countries and trying to sow seeds of national strife in the USSR, to cause a nationalist and religious “boom”, and an “erosion of socialism”, are active in the United States alone. The pace is set by the notorious National Conference on Soviet Jewry formed in 1970 on the basis of a similar subversive organisation that had existed since 1964.

The National Conference on Soviet Jewry is, in fact, an umbrella for something like a hundred Zionist and pro-Zionist organisations. It has branches in about 200 cities across the country, and engages on a large scale in collecting and processing material aimed at discrediting the home and foreign policy of the Soviet Union. It also sponsors all sorts of anti-Soviet actions, notably “protest demonstrations” against economic, scientific, and cultural ties between the USA and the USSR. One of its functions is to exert pressure on the pro-Israeli Zionist lobby in US Congress and the Administration. This is done in close collaboration with the National Jewish Community Relations Advisory Council and the Conference of Presidents of Major American Jewish Organisations, which have access to the White House, the Department of State, and other top agencies. Systematic pressure on US Congress is also exerted by the American Israel Public Affairs Committee.

In the US scientific community, pro-Zionist anti-Soviet activities are conducted mostly by the Academic Committee on Soviet Jewry, which fabricates tales of oppression of scientists of Jewish background in the Soviet Union.

American Jewish students are brainwashed in an anti-Soviet spirit by a large number of Zionist youth organisations, specific departments of the WZO and WJC, and, notably, a body that calls itself Student Struggle for Soviet Jewry.

Similar activities among pious Jews in the USA are conducted by Al Tidom (Don't Be Silent).

Zionist fascist stormtroopers of the Jewish Defense League, the Jewish Armed Resistance, and Jewish Direct Action engage in terrorism and incitement—and this with the connivance of the authorities—in a bid to complicate US-Soviet relations. They have been attacking Soviet diplomats and members of their families, trying to break up concerts of Soviet performers touring the USA, setting off bombs in Aeroflot offices, firing on buildings of the USSR Mission at the UN and the homes of Soviet citizens, and so on.

Similar organisations (whose analogues also exist in Israel and some Western countries) hold months, weeks, days and demonstrations of what they call “solidarity with Soviet Jews”. They convene all sorts of conferences and symposiums, which in concert with other anti-Communists and anti-Sovieteers, keep mulling over the non-existent Jewish question in the USSR, complaining about “Soviet anti-Semitism disguised as anti-Zionism”, howling about the “suppression of Jewish culture in socialist countries”, and so on. Venomous conferences to that effect were held in 1971 and 1976 in Brussels, and in 1983 in Jerusalem. Their organisers counted on considerable political and propaganda dividends. But they miscalculated. The world public, and that includes certain Jewish organisations, condemned them, while the assembly in Jerusalem was almost completely ignored even by the bourgeois press, because few people in the world still believe the tale of Soviet anti-Semitism. (Even the Zionist newspaper *Haaretz* described the Jerusalem conference as a farce.)

Holding up their false dogma about a worldwide Jewish nation and the perpetuity of anti-Semitism as a shield, Zionist centres interfere in the internal affairs of the socialist countries. In the disguise of tourists, journalists, diplo-

mats, exchange scientists, and so on, they send their emissaries to try and incite nationalist and seditious views among Soviet Jews, and found nationalist organisations. Underground "religious", "scientific" and "cultural" seminars, and "clubs for opinion exchanges" are promoted and widely advertised by Zionist and imperialist mass media. Through these channels Zionist leaders hope to implant among at least some Soviet Jews the seditious idea of "dual loyalty".

Zionist leaders make no bones about the meaning of "Israel's central place in the life of the world Jewry" and "dual loyalty", which are both contrary to the basic principles of international law. David Ben-Gurion, Israel's first prime minister, declared, for example, that this meant aiding Israel, whether or not the government of the country where Jews live likes it. Speaking of a single Jewish nation, he said, Zionists must ignore the fact that Jews were scattered all over the world and that they were citizens of the states in which they lived. Zionist novelist Leon Uris went so far as to declare that any Jew in any country of the world is, or should be, a potential source of information and support for any Mossad agent.

In pursuance of their own aims, Zionists join imperialist anti-Soviet campaigns to heap mountains of slanderous lies upon the Soviet Union, alleging Soviet anti-Semitism. Ben-Gurion, for one, did not shrink from comparing the Great October Socialist Revolution to the Hitler regime, describing both as "two terrible calamities" for the Jews.¹ Golda Meir, another former Israeli prime minister, stated on more than one occasion that the Soviet Union was a "truly imperialist power".² Harping on the malicious lie that anti-Semitism is a built-in feature of Soviet ideology, Arie Dultzin, president of the WZO, wrote that the Soviet Union wants to saddle its ideology on the whole world and that it is, therefore, responsible for the mounting anti-Semitism in the West.

¹ *Davar*, December 24, 1971.

² *Information Bulletin of the Communist Party of Israel*, 1970, p. 31.

The vast majority of Soviet Jews have nothing in common with the stereotypes and cliches spread about them by Western propaganda centres, and by Zionist and pro-Zionist spokesmen. The Jews of the Soviet Union are an indissoluble part of the new historical community—the Soviet people—and participate devotedly in building communist society. They work conscientiously in various sectors of the national economy, health, education, science, and the arts. And contrary to the malicious slander of Zionists and their allies, the Jewish Soviet Socialist Yiddish culture is making good headway in fraternal association with the other Soviet national cultures. Those are facts that no demagoguery can upset or erode.

Backed by imperialist mass media, capitalising on the problem of reunifying families and on the religious feelings of some people, and extolling Israel as a “prospering” Jewish homeland, the Zionists hope to persuade a million Soviet Jews to come to Israel. They have sent something like 700,000 “invitations” to Soviet citizens of Jewish background. Like their imperialist patrons, they go out of their way to incite nationalist feelings among Soviet Jews, on the one hand, and mistrust of Jews among people of other nationalities, on the other. Yet all these undertakings, however costly they may be, are suffering ignominious failure.

It is common knowledge that most former Soviet Jews who have resettled in Israel and other capitalist countries are bitterly disappointed. There is the evidence, among other things, of the stream of letters from those who had fallen for imperialist and Zionist propaganda. They describe the tragic fate of people who have learned the meaning of social incompatibility.

The process of reuniting families divided by the past war, is practically complete. This, coupled with the aforesaid facts, has brought about a radical decline in the number of applications for leaving the USSR. Some of those who had applied formerly, have come to understand that they had fallen under the harmful influence of Zionist and imperialist propaganda. They have gone back on their intentions which have already had such tragic consequences

for so many, and abandoned the idea of emigrating.¹ All this has infuriated the Zionists and their imperialist patrons. Western propaganda has mounted a ferocious slander campaign, maintaining without the slightest grounds that the Soviet authorities have "by administrative means" and "forcibly" detained Jews who want to leave for Israel and other "free world" countries. This is contrary to the facts and amounts to yet another anti-Soviet ideological act of diversion.

Seeing that their plans of inspiring a mass exodus of Soviet Jews had fallen through and that those who had initially believed the Promised Land propaganda are deeply disappointed, Zionists have these days shifted the emphasis on demands that Jewish culture should have greater "freedom to develop" in the USSR. What is behind this demagogical demand was candidly revealed by J. Garkavi, director of the cultural department of the WJC Executive. "As concerns the needs of Jewish culture," he said, "they must be met only if this culture is needed by Israel".² Zionists dream of a "cultural national autonomy" for Soviet Jews. Yet the nationalist reactionary substance of such autonomy had been conclusively exposed back at the dawn of the 20th century by Vladimir Lenin. Soviet people, and that includes Soviet Jews, are perfectly well aware that Zionists and their patrons are not interested in the advancement of Jewish culture, and that all they want is an opportunity to brainwash some section of Soviet Jews in a pro-Zionist spirit. They reject this Zionist manoeuvre.

In 1983, the establishment in the USSR of a new voluntary organisation known as the Anti-Zionist Committee of Soviet Public Opinion triggered a howl of anti-Soviet fury

¹ In addition to those who left the USSR to reunite with their families, there were those who wanted to do so for religious reasons or for reasons of an emotional nature. There were also those who wanted to engage in independent business activity, those who were nothing short of adventurers, and those who had committed crimes (profiteering, embezzlement, and the like) and wished to escape retribution.

² *Undser Vort*, Paris, 1975.

among Zionists and their patrons. The Zionist propaganda machine, backed in every possible way by imperialist media, launched one more frenzied campaign charging the Soviet Union of "anti-Semitism" and "anti-Israeli sentiment".¹

The Zionists also resort to radio transmissions and correspondence with persons living in the Soviet Union and other socialist countries. They use every possible channel to smuggle in Zionist and other reactionary, counter-revolutionary propaganda, with radio propaganda getting top priority. The so-called ideological directives adopted in January 1972 by the 28th WZO Congress stressed that propagation by radio of Zionist ideas in the Soviet Union and other socialist countries is a matter of paramount importance and urgency.²

Zionists and pro-Zionists hold influential, sometimes key, posts in such cold-war outfits as Radio Liberty and Radio Free Europe. No few Zionists and pro-Zionists are employed as editors and announcers by the Voice of America, the BBC, Radio Canada, and Deutsche Welle, and at radio stations of other Western countries. As for the Voice of Israel, here Zionist propaganda, anti-Sovietism and anti-communism constitute the main ingredient of all broadcast, especially those beamed to the Soviet Union and other socialist countries.

Martin Seliger, chairman of the Israel Political Science Association, attaches immense importance to the indoctrination of people in various countries in an anti-communist, and also Zionist and pro-Zionist, spirit. He wants ideology to be in the interests of capitalism and to the detriment of communism.³

Israeli Sovietologists take a most active part in anti-Soviet actions sponsored by various international, as well as national, centres. The Association of Israeli Sovietologists, along with fourteen other national and regional or-

¹ See, inter alia, *The Jerusalem Post*, April 11, 1983.

² *Maariv*, April 2, 1972.

³ See Martin Seliger, *Ideology and Politics*, Allen and Unwin, London, 1976, p. 273.

ganisations of the same type, comprise the International Information Centre of Soviet and East European Studies at the University of Glasgow, formed in 1974.

Mossad and the intelligence agencies of international Zionist centres operate hand in hand with the CIA and the secret services of various capitalist countries against the socialist countries, notably the Soviet Union. The Jewish Documentation Centre with headquarters in Vienna, headed by former Nazi agent Simon Wiesenthal, for example, is at present financed by the CIA and is, in effect, an Israeli spy centre in Europe. Wiesenthal's agents seek contact with Jews from the Soviet Union in attempts to enlist them as agents of Israeli or Western intelligence services. Branches of the Jewish Documentation Centre have been set up in some other capitalist countries.

Wiesenthal's Centre also fabricates anti-communist and anti-Soviet material, which is then sent to certain West-European Sovietological institutes. Zionist propaganda and "study" agencies literally swamp certain countries with their literature.

Wiesenthal and some other Zionists are closely connected with the so-called International Association for Human Rights in Frankfurt on the Main, instituted on orders of NATO intelligence services and originally headed by blatant anti-Sovieteer K. Gerstenmaier. Along with renegade Jiří Pelikan, who was director-general of the Czechoslovak radio and television until 1968, Gerstenmaier and Wiesenthal are the chief initiators of the so-called preparatory committee of the Helsinki European Group, whose purpose is to distort the truth about the implementation of the Helsinki accords.

Zionists went out of their way to organise the publication in the USSR of nationalist and seditious typescript journals and other illegal matter of the same kind. But here the ideological invaders were thwarted by the vigilance of Soviet people, and suffered complete failure.

Working hand in hand with various renegades and deserters, Zionists try very hard to cultivate nationalist sentiment, and the wish to emigrate, among a certain segment of Jews in the socialist countries. But that is not

all. They also endeavour to estrange them from the Marxist-Leninist ideology and the building of socialism.

Zionist and pro-Zionist theorists play a part in concocting and dressing up pseudo-scientific concepts falsifying or distorting the Marxist-Leninist ideology, and the home and foreign policy of the Soviet Union and the socialist community as a whole. Zionist ideologists propagate anti-Soviet and anti-communist theories and help imperialist centres work up new acts of ideological subversion.

* * *

Zionists and pro-Zionists exploit their representatives or confederates in various influential organisations sponsored by imperialist circles. Pro-Zionists, for example, play a specific part in the so-called Bilderberg Club and the Trilateral Commission, formed in 1954 and 1973 respectively, which are a type of elitist imperialist "brain bank". Zionist, and notably pro-Zionist elements, are widely represented on the so-called Committee on the Present Danger constituted in the USA in 1976 by various right-wing groups engaging in systematic incitement of anti-Soviet hysteria and escalation of tensions.

Pro-Zionists and Zionists were strongly represented among the founders of the Committee for the Free World, an international anti-Soviet and anti-communist organisation formed in 1981. Its organisers set out to mount intensive propaganda in defence of Western "values" and against the Soviet Union, the socialist community as a whole, the communist movement, the progressive developing countries, and national liberation movements.

Zionists and their supporters endeavour to direct the activity of the International Parliamentary Group for Human Rights in the Soviet Union formed in the spring of 1984, which encompasses right-wing members of parliament from the USA, Britain, the FRG, Italy, Canada, Sweden, and a few other Western countries. In a bid to divert the attention of the world public from the crucial problems of our time and to revive the Western slander campaign for human rights in the Soviet Union, which

has in fact totally failed, the above group is trying to galvanise the trumped-up issue of discrimination against Soviet Jews.

In January 1985, one more pro-Zionist group was formed to kick around the non-existent Jewish question in the USSR. It took the name of Coalition for the Defence of Soviet Jews, and encompasses some 40 per cent of US Senators and Congressmen.

Zionists and pro-Zionists are widely represented in US institutions dealing with international affairs, and have strong positions in various non-governmental organisations that engage in anti-communist and anti-Soviet propaganda, howling about breaches of human rights in the Soviet Union.

At the end of the 1950s, Israel's rulers began training anti-communist personnel from Africa, Latin America and Asia in a few of their educational establishments, and were financed in this by the AFL-CIO, the British Trades Union Congress, the West German Friedrich Ebert Fund, Swiss and Scandinavian social-reformist organisations, some EEC bodies, and certain monopoly corporations in the USA and other countries.

A Centre for Socialist Thought has been functioning under the auspices of Mapai's Educational and Research Centre since 1967. Its purpose is to aid right-wing Social-Democrats in Africa and Asia, promote anti-communist and anti-Soviet activities there, and help work out pro-Western arguments to counter the concept and practice of the socialist orientation in the young Afro-Asian countries and in Latin America. Already in 1960, Ben-Gurion had asked the US government to grant Israel credits "for struggle against communism in Black Africa".¹

Stoking up anti-Sovietism and falsifying the facts, retired Major-General Haim Herzog, who had held various influential offices and is now President of Israel, wrote: "If Israel had not started the June 1967 war, the entire Middle East, the west and south of Asia and a large section of the

¹ Walter Hollstein, *Kein Frieden um Israel*, Fischer Taschenbuch Verlag, Frankfurt-on-Main, 1972, p. 225.

African continent would have fallen under Soviet influence. What was at stake was domination over a considerable part of the world.”¹

Zionist-ruled Israel, which describes itself as a bastion of anti-communism, is getting enormous funding from the imperialist powers, first of all the United States. To justify this flow of dollars, West German marks, pounds sterling, South African rands, and so on, Tel Aviv is conducting feverish anti-communist and anti-Soviet activity with the backing of Zionist centres abroad.

Zionists are always among the most active in nearly all the anti-Soviet and anti-communist campaigns of recent years. Hand in hand with reactionary extremists, they have resisted the detente in international affairs, and keep howling about a Soviet “war threat”, Soviet “involvement” in international terrorism, and the trumped-up human rights problem in the Soviet Union and other socialist countries.

Charges of terrorism have always been the imperialists’ poisonous weapon against the communist movement. Even before ex-Secretary of State Alexander Haig had made the allegation that the Soviet Union was instigating international terrorism, slanderous charges to that effect had been appearing systematically in Zionist and pro-Zionist publications. In January 1978, for example, the journal *Midstream*, published by and for the Zionist and pro-Zionist American-Jewish elite, alleged that terrorism was the life-blood of Bolshevism, that it was a built-in feature of the communist system. The journal *American Zionist*, whose name speaks for itself, published fabrications about the Soviet Union supporting international terrorism in October 1980. *Commentary*, the journal of the pro-Zionist American Jewish Committee, contributed considerably to the Bulgarian lead story in the attempt on the life of Pope John-Paul II by Turkish neo-fascist Mehmet Ali Agca.

The Zionist and pro-Zionist lobby had a hand in turning Jimmy Carter’s administration from detente to cold war. In unison with extreme rightist forces, the Zionist press

¹ Quoted from *World Marxist Review*, May 1979, p. 46.

and Zionist speakers at various forums keep repeating methodically that detente would clear the way for Soviet global domination, that Russians cannot be trusted because they have a totalitarian regime, that the Soviets want a detente that would yield them visible economic advantages, and so on, and so forth. Like other rightist forces, Zionists and pro-Zionists accuse the US Administration of being too moderate in relation to the Soviet Union, and of having allowed America to lag behind militarily. In short, the Zionist leadership invariably hangs together with the reactionaries who beat the drums for more US militarisation and greater US aggressiveness.

International Zionism and Israel's rulers are doing their utmost to distort Soviet policy in the Middle East—a policy that is aimed at securing just and lasting peace in that explosive region in the interests of all its peoples. Yet Zionist mass media allege that the Soviet Union clings to the “traditional foreign policy of tsarism” in the Middle East, that it is “destabilising the situation in the region”, and that it is “using the Arab-Israeli conflict to penetrate into the region”. They call the Palestinians agents of Moscow, and say the future Palestinian state would quickly fall “into the hands of Russian military advisers”, and so on. They charge the Soviet Union of wanting to destroy Israel, and describe how the Russians would one day “invade Israel”.¹

* * *

Zionists and pro-Zionists were active in the counter-revolutionary coalitions in Czechoslovakia (1968-69) and Poland (1980-81).

Like many other reactionary organisations abroad, Zionist centres had contacts with the anti-socialist Public Self-Defence Committee and Committee of Workers' Defence (KSS-KOR), and extremist elements in Solidarity.

Working hand in hand with the CIA, the West German

¹ See M. Kaufman, *The Coming Destruction of Israel*, Signet, New York, 1970.

BND and some other Western intelligence services, Mossad contributed its two bits' worth to aggravating the crisis in Poland. Nor did it confine itself to propaganda actions only. It dispensed financial aid to Zionist and pro-Zionist elements in Solidarity, with Polish emigrants who had settled in Western countries also backing counter-revolutionary forces in Poland.

A. J. Libenbaum, who had emigrated from Lodz some years before, acting on orders from various anti-Polish, including Zionist groups, had been systematically smuggling seditious publications and printing equipment into Poland from southern Sweden. A Cyprus newspaper reported on March 3, 1981, that KSS-KOR leaders had close contacts with Zionists, who were influencing part of the KSS-KOR and Solidarity leadership.

In April 1981, Chicago Zionist M. Krug called on fellow Zionists to follow events in Poland more closely, because "vital Jewish interests in Europe and America were connected with it". Stressing his sympathy for "leaders undermining the Polish communist government", he said in so many words that the anti-communist and anti-Soviet aspect of the movement in Poland guaranteed its leaders support in the United States and Western Europe. The pro-Zionist professor, Irving Kristol, an avowed neo-conservative, called on the US Administration and American secret services "to destabilise the situation in Eastern Europe" or, in other words, work for the overthrow of the socialist system.

The Israeli government issued appeals that the campaign against socialist Poland should be stepped up, and General Ariel Sharon, the executioner of Sabra and Chatila, who was then Defence Minister, went to the length of accusing US and other Western leaders of failing to show due zeal in the fight against Poland.¹

To this day, Zionist propaganda is taking an active part in the reactionary campaign of subversion against Poland's socialist forces. The old lie about "traditional Polish anti-Semitism" is being tied in with equally slanderous charges that the Polish leadership had concocted "the version of a

¹ *Maariv*, December 25, 1981.

Zionist conspiracy" and is blaming all difficulties in the country on the Jews.

Hand in hand with other anti-socialist forces, revisionists and renegades, Zionist centres sponsor acts of subversion against the socialist system in Poland, the Polish United Workers' Party, and socialist democracy. They collaborate closely with the seditious Radio Free Europe, the reactionary Paris-based emigré journal *Kultura*, and other anti-communist groups.

In the late sixties, we may recall, when a right-wing opportunist group under Dubček had ensconced itself in power in Czechoslovakia, Zionists and pro-Zionists contributed their bit to the efforts of world reaction to restore the capitalist order in that country under the cover of "socialism with a human face". Examining the situation after the 13th Congress of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia (1966), the December 1970 Central Committee Plenum of the CPC, noted: "A considerable influence in the struggle against socialism in Czechoslovakia was exerted by forces which operated actively in the context of Zionism, one of the instruments of international imperialism and anti-communism."

The right-wing opportunists connected with Western Zionist elements, tried, among other things, to prevail on the Czechoslovak government to stop supporting the Arab nations. Zionists and their allies tried to portray Zionism as a progressive and democratic movement, and to whitewash Israel's rulers. Czechoslovak communist internationalists had repulsed these designs, and the counter-revolution and opportunism were routed.

* * *

There is a number of reasons for international Zionism's continuous intensification of its anti-Soviet and anti-communist activity, and its ever more active participation in the Reagan Administration's "crusade" against the socialist countries.

One of these reasons is the class hatred that Zionists nourish against communism, their deep hostility to the

world's first country that ended the exploitation of man by man and resolved the Jewish question (like the national question as a whole) in a democratic way on the basis of socialist internationalism.

The Zionists are also incensed over the steadfast Soviet policy of supporting the national liberation struggle, including that of the peoples of the Arab East, of assisting victims of Israeli aggression, seeking a just settlement of the Middle East conflict in the interests of all the peoples and countries of that region, and promoting the founding of a sovereign Palestinian state.

Furthermore, the enormous financial aid and the continuous political, military and economic support which the imperialists are extending to the rulers of Israel, have to be paid for. And the Zionists are paying—notably by acts of subversion against the Soviet Union, the socialist community as a whole, and the world communist movement.

The anti-Soviet howls over the question of “discrimination against Soviet Jews” is also meant to draw public attention away from the Zionist policy of aggression and occupation, and the deep crisis in Israel. Fanning anti-Sovietism and anti-communism, Zionist leaders are out to deceive the mass of the people in Israel and Jews in bourgeois countries, and to psychologically prepare them for Tel Aviv's permanent aggression against the Arab peoples of Palestine and the neighbouring Arab states.

The malicious calls for “saving” Soviet Jews have yet another aim. They are meant to discredit the progressive Jewish organisations and leaders in the West active in the general struggle for peace, democracy and social progress.

The strategic collaboration started by the United States and Israel in 1981 is directed not only against the Arab national liberation movement, but also (and above all) against the Soviet Union. Ever since that collaboration began, Zionism's anti-communist and anti-Soviet activity has been an ever more conspicuous part of imperialism's acts of subversion against the revolutionary process in the world. In May 1986, Tel Aviv officially joined the so-called Strategic Defence Initiative of the United States, that is, the Star Wars plan.

The true substance of the Zionist ideology and propaganda is being understood by an ever greater number of people. Still, Zionism is much more successful than other varieties of imperialist ideology and policy in influencing a fairly large section of Jews in Israel and other capitalist countries, and misleading certain sections of the world public, including some progressives. This is done by spending enormous funds, by continuous maneuvering, adroit demagoguery, good organization, and the extensive help received from a large spectrum of reactionary politicians.

To a certain extent, Zionists are still helped by their disguises, some highly inventive and shrewd, as a national movement, a protector of Judaism and Jewish culture, and by their exploitation of anti-Semitism that is still widespread in most capitalist countries. Among other things, they do not hesitate to falsify the facts of history.

Anti-communist sentiment, coupled with the chauvinism and militarism rampant in Israel and among a section of Jews in the United States and other capitalist countries, is being continuously whipped up in Zionist and pro-Zionist mass media, the Israeli government, the entire mechanism of international Zionism. That is why Zionism, serving imperialism and working hand in hand with reactionaries throughout the world, is a dangerous and perfidious adversary, quite liable to harm the Arab national liberation movement and, indeed, all forces working for detente, social progress, and democracy.

To consolidate peace and social progress, to further the interests of all nations, the people of Israel included, Marxists-Leninists consistently expose the ideology and political practices of international Zionism. They tear off its false disguises and show, among other things, what a danger Zionists constitute for the people of Israel and Jews in other countries. Combatting Zionism and the aggressive policy of Israel's rulers, and also combatting anti-Semitism that has struck deep roots in many bourgeois countries, is important as part of the general struggle for progress, democracy, and socialism, and against imperialism and its allies.

M. Goldenberg

THE ZIONIST VARIETY OF ANTI-SOVIETISM

THE CULTURAL SCENE

Anti-Sovietism is these days an invariable element of all reactionary doctrines and political currents. And Zionism—the chauvinist ideology and anti-communist policy of the Jewish bourgeoisie organically connected with international imperialist circles, above all those of the USA—is no exception.

Zionists often allege that a massive campaign is underway in the Soviet Union to destroy the Jewish national culture. Zionists hope that this lie will help them establish “stewardship” over Jews in all countries. Their special efforts, however, are directed to thrusting into the consciousness of Soviet Jews and alienating them from the progressive multinational culture of the Soviet peoples.

We should remember that this is not mere malice aforethought. Owing to their philistine limitations, Zionists and their various patrons and followers, are unable to understand the following important point: in matters of culture, the Communist Party has always acted on Lenin’s injunction, namely, that “we take *from each* national culture only its democratic and socialist elements; we take them *only* and *absolutely* in opposition to the bourgeois culture and the bourgeois nationalism of *each* nation”.¹

Conversely, bourgeois nationalists pick chiefly reactionary, clerical and chauvinist elements in the respective national culture as food for the spirit of “their” peoples. As concerns Jewish culture, Zionists strive to fill it to the brim with nationalism and mysticism, seeking to instil in the “world

¹ V. I. Lenin, “Critical Remarks on the National Question”, *Collected Works*, Vol. 20, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1977, p. 24.

Jewry" a fanatical belief that Jews are God's chosen people.

Graphic evidence of the culture promoted by Zionists is the book of US Zionist and clerical G. Wook, published in Russian in Jerusalem. "In the dark Middle Ages," he writes, "the Jewish ghetto was a tiny island in an ocean of ignorance, Jewish knowledge being much higher than the knowledge of the society outside the ghetto."

That is what the world looks like to a nationalist. A more considered view of things would show that in the Middle Ages, and in later times too, only "eminent" rabbis were sources of "knowledge" in the ghettos, and that all memories of them have long since vanished, whereas Dante, Copernicus, Erasmus, Shakespeare, Rabelais and Spinoza flourished outside the ghettos. Yes, Spinoza too. Because, despite his Jewish origin, he had not been bred in a ghetto, had been a product of its negation, or, more precisely, of bitter struggle against the ghetto. And that applies not only to Spinoza, but to all those Jews of advanced views who contributed to the everlasting values of world culture. If Jews should have had nothing but the ghetto culture that Wook so admires, they would have remained a spiritually barren branch of humanity.

It is hardly surprising that Mr. Wook bewails the lot of the Jewish people of the Soviet Union, who have rejected the ghetto culture. "Soviet Jews," he writes in his book, "suffer from cultural asphyxiation: it is bloodless slaughter in which the body survives and the Jew ceases to be a Jew." Yet in the same book he complains that "in the United States, where Jews can do as they wish, neglect of their rich heritage has attained monstrous proportions. The constant pressure that compels individuals to be like everybody else, is gradually eroding the Jewish spiritual heritage."

Wook's "differentiated" approach is easy to see through. One and the same thing he calls neglect (by Jews themselves!) of their "cultural heritage", since it occurs in the United States, and "spiritual slaughter" (by anti-Semites and atheists), since it occurs in the Soviet Union.

Here are a few more facts to show that the demand for "Jewish cultural values" is anything but lively in capitalist

countries. Geula Cohen, an ultra-rightist member of Knesset, has recently observed that 80 per cent of Jewish children in America are not getting a Jewish education. Yet she does not accuse American Jews of "spiritually slaughtering" their children. And the French newspaper, *Croix*, recently carried the following revealing report: no more than 2,000 out of the 100,000 children of fugitives from Israel who settled in the United States, are getting a Jewish education. It follows, first, that the chauvinist religious "culture" that had been stuffed down their throats during their stay in Israel has been rejected by their parents, who also want to preserve their children from it. It is obvious, second, that despite Zionist efforts to the contrary, interest in such a "culture" among US Jews is not very high.

In the final analysis, all complaints about the decline of the "Jewish culture" that has come down from the medieval ghetto, tend to boomerang against the Zionist pharisees themselves. In Russia and Poland, Wook writes, the Jews' acceptance of lay culture had been much slower than in Western Europe. He explains that "the credit for this belonged to the despotic tsarist regime which had restricted the right of Jews to getting an education and had forcibly detained them within the Jewish pale".¹

"Shame on accursed tsarism which tortured and persecuted the Jews!"² These words belong to Lenin, and express the attitude of every decent Russian to the tsarist autocracy's Jew-baiting policy.

Yet Wook, bearer of the Zionist ideology, maintains that "tsarism had done well by the Jews".

These two attitudes are expressive of the class incompatibility of proletarian internationalism and bourgeois nationalism, of the latter's hatred for the interests of the working people, including those of the working people belonging to the ethnic group which the nationalist in question

¹ G. Wook, *This G'd of Mine*, Jerusalem, 1977, pp. 10, 317, 319, 411, 412. The clerical author, as we see, is faithful to the Judaic taboo on pronouncing or writing the word God.

² V. I. Lenin, "Anti-Jewish Pogroms", *Collected Works*, Vol. 29, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1974, p. 253.

professes to champion. The Zionist considers it a good thing that the tsarist government oppressed Jews and thereby "helped" them avoid lay culture and preserve their "identity" based on Talmudic dogmas. The Jewish nationalist is ready to extol this, and to pay for it with the blood of the victims of anti-Semitic pogroms. Conversely, for him it is an "unforgivable fault" of the Soviet system that the worker-peasant government delivered Jews from persecution and gave them access to education, and to the democratic socialist culture.

Soviet people of any nationality, including most Jews, have nothing but abhorrence for the Zionist "cultural programme". As they have for analogous programmes of the Ukrainian, Lithuanian, Armenian, Tatar, and other bourgeois nationalists.

Any progressive is proud of the progressive traditions of his people. He rejects anything that is reactionary. It is only right that Russians are proud of Lenin and Plekhanov, Pushkin and Tolstoi, Tchaikovsky and Gorky. Yet if some Russian declared pride in the fact that Serafim Sarovsky or Ioann Kronshtadtsky, the Orthodox thaumaturgists or wonder-workers, had been Russians, he would find that the vast majority of Russians disagreed.

Likewise, Jews may be legitimately proud of those whom Lenin called the finest sons of the Jewry, progressive leaders of democracy and socialism, "the best Jews, those who are celebrated in world history".¹ Jews may doubtless be proud of philosopher Spinoza, scientist Einstein, writer Sholem Aleichem, artist Levitan, revolutionaries Uritsky and Volodarsky. But if a Jew is moved by religious "values" inherited from Talmudists like Rabbi Hillel and Rabbi Akiba ben Joseph, or admires the works of Theodor Herzl, David Ben-Gurion and other Zionists, those inglorious heralds of nationalism, he merits no more support than any Russian worshipper of Ioann Kronshtadtsky, reactionary philosopher Berdiayev, or any other bearer of Russian great-power chauvinism.

¹ V. I. Lenin, "Critical Remarks on the National Question", *op. cit.*, p. 29.

Lenin pointed out that Jewish culture has great progressive features—its internationalism, its identification with the advanced movements of the epoch—though there is also the slogan of a Jewish “national culture” promoted by enemies of the proletariat, supporters of the old Jewish exclusiveness, accomplices of the rabbis and the bourgeoisie.¹ For us, the above has always been a true compass.

Any genuine cultural figure of any nationality in our time belongs to progressive movements, and rejects everything that is old and outmoded. He cannot be a nationalist. He cannot be an obscurantist or man-hater. In short, he cannot belong to the reactionary camp, because that would destroy him as an intellectual.

And one more thing. Any enlightened internationalist will never stoop to spurning any “alien” national culture, to belittling the great sons of other nations. Because the true values of any culture, like the true geniuses, belong to all humankind.

To what moral depths Zionist champions of “Jewish culture” can stoop is illustrated by the example of anti-Sovieteer Jacques Givet, who has tackled “Soviet anti-Semitism” chiefly from a “cultural” angle. This malicious slanderer found nothing more credible to say than that Jews in the Soviet Union live in “a situation of a colonial type”.² It may be concluded therefrom that they are enslaved by some “higher race” and suffer the inevitable effects of colonial rule, notably illiteracy and total lack of culture. Far be it from us to try and convince M. Givet that he is wrong. That would be useless. All we can do, indeed, is to advise him to read one of the books of a Sovietologist who is far better known than he is, namely, Hélène Carrère D'Encausse. Her numerous opuses are also published in Paris. She is far more refined than Givet, and does not reject some commonly known facts, confining herself to producing interpretations that suit her purpose. In a chapter on Soviet Jews in her anti-Soviet book, *L'Empire éclaté*, she agrees,

¹ V. I. Lenin, “Critical Remarks on the National Question”, *Collected Works*, Vol. 20, p. 26.

² Jacques Givet, *Israël et le génocide inachevé*, Paris, 1979, p. 124.

among other things, that Jews in the Soviet Union are an educated ethnic group with a high level of professional training.¹ Her approach to these facts, however, is little less than "dialectical". She regards them as a boon and at once an evil—for education is useful and therefore a boon, and an evil because, having accumulated secular knowledge, a Jew forfeits his "identity" and "ancient culture". Let me repeat, however, that D'Encausse does not go against the facts and makes no ludicrous statement about any "colonial status" of Soviet citizens if they happen to be Jews.

Advocates of Zionism are liable to reply that D'Encausse is neither a Jewess nor a Zionist, and does not, therefore, "understand the pain and anger of the Jews". Let that be as it may. May I then refer to the monograph of Howard M. Sachar, professor at George Washington University. This fairly well-known Zionist historian writes that Jews in the Soviet Union are a well-educated and literate ethnic group that plays a disproportionately active role in the intellectual and scientific life of their country. True, Sachar would be a poor Zionist if he did not go farther. He deemed fit to add that Soviet Jews achieved this "despite restrictions".² Leaving the "restrictions" to Sachar's competence, we can only note that the educational standard of Jews "languishing under a colonial yoke" is not in the least lower than that of their non-Jewish "colonialists".

It is typical of all Zionist authors to twist even the truthful facts about the life of Soviet Jews and cast a shadow on all things Soviet.

The Zionist *Jerusalem Post* discovered, for example, that in a mathematics book with 94 articles published in the Soviet Union in 1978, ten were written by Jews. Is that good? Certainly not, says the Zionist mouthpiece, for in previous books there had been more than ten. With more than 10 per cent of the items published in an academic

¹ Hélène Carrère D'Encausse, *L'Empire éclaté. La revolte des nations en U.R.S.S.*, Flammarion, Paris, 1978, pp. 250-259.

² Howard M. Sachar, *A History of Israel. From the Rise of Zionism to Our Time*, Basil Blackwell, Oxford, 1977, p. 732.

book belonging to authors of Jewish origin, newsmen blinded by hatred describe this as "anti-Semitic discrimination".

It should be clear to anyone that if we were to set out on the senseless exercise of counting how many Ukrainians, Armenians, Georgians, Jews, etc., had been published in any journal over a certain period, and to compare the figures to any other equal period, we would be sure to find considerable discrepancies. For it would not occur to any editor to plan the national composition of his contributors in advance. In that sense, the principle of planned guidance is totally inapplicable. The Zionists, who have their own nationalist yardstick, allege, however, that there are racist rules in the Soviet Union. Probably because racism is practised in Israel, where even cows and sheep are registered as either Jewish or non-Jewish.

Another "example" of "anti-Semitism" spotted by the *Jerusalem Post* is that a certain Soviet citizen of Jewish origin had failed to defend his academic thesis. That could be corrected: not just one citizen, but many more, and among them Russians, Ukrainians, Letts, Moldavians, Tajiks and others who had, not for lack of trying, failed to win an academic degree. But here the Zionist could not care less. Jewish nationalists, like the Ukrainian, German, Japanese or any other nationalists, see the world divided into two—into "their own" and "not their own". "Their own" are the salt of the earth, while the others are sub-human, whose lot is of no interest to them. There's nothing to be done—it's the bourgeois nationalist outlook.

Yet there is no getting away from the objective facts. They cannot be evaded. And they show that Jews in the Soviet Union are organically part of the new historical community of people—the Soviet people. No few outstanding revolutionaries, scientists, writers, actors, artists and sculptors, have come from their midst. More than 160,000 men and officers of Jewish origin were decorated for courage and bravery in the war against the Nazis, and 132 of them were awarded the high title of Hero of the Soviet Union.

There is not a single case where a Jew in the USSR was

denied his constitutional rights, which are dependably guaranteed to every Soviet citizen irrespective of nationality. Nor is there any case where some additional duty or duties not provided for in Soviet legislation had been imposed on Jews. Nor can anyone say that the living standard among Soviet Jews is lower than that of non-Jews, or that their opportunities for cultural advancement are restricted.

There is a connection between the condition of Jews in the Soviet Union and the process of overcoming the distinctions between town and country. These distinctions have not been eliminated as yet. And since Soviet Jews are mostly city people, there are specific features about their development. In the 1950s to 1970s, the countrywide censuses showed that the Jewish population was declining in number. Not because some Jews had left the Soviet Union. There was also the more intensive convergence of nations, nationalities, and ethnic groups in towns than in the country, on the one hand, and the lower birth rate in towns than in the country, on the other.

Bourgeois propaganda, first of all that of the Zionists, alleges that Jews in the Soviet Union are discriminated against. Let us note, however, that the condition of Jews in the Soviet Union cannot be worse than that of non-Jews for the simple reason that city life in our country still has certain advantages over village life, especially as concerns culture and consumption of cultural values.

ANTI-SOVIETEERS IN LINGUISTICS

Anti-Sovieteers maintain that Hebrew is banned in the Soviet Union, whereas no Jewish culture can survive without it. "Hebrew," writes the Chief Rabbi of the United Hebrew Congregations of the British Commonwealth of Nations, "is the one language banished, among the scores of national tongues spoken and taught in the USSR."¹

¹ Immanuel Jakobovits, *The Timely and the Timeless. Jews, Judaism and Society in a Storm-Tossed Decade*, Valentine-Mitchel, London, 1977, p. 114.

What is this, a deliberate lie or mere ignorance? If the Chief Rabbi sees fit to plead ignorance, it is not in our power to forbid him. We assume, however, that it is not mere ignorance. Because he cannot fail to know that in the Soviet Union (which, by the way, he has visited), as in Britain and the United States, France and other countries, Hebrew has never been the national tongue of the Jews. Even most Zionists in Britain do not know Hebrew, and if some of them do have a smattering of it, they learnt it specially with Zionist prompting.

Far be it from me to disparage Hebrew. That would be absurd. There is no such thing as a bad language. And I do not mean to say Hebrew is harmful as such. The point I want to make is something else. "The revival of Hebrew as a secular language," says the *Encyclopaedia of Zionism and Israel*, "[is] connected with Zionism." That is entirely true. Here I have no cause to take issue with the Zionists. It was, indeed, they who reanimated Hebrew, a dead language, at the end of the past century, making it one of the crucial symbols and instruments of Zionist ideology and practice. And it serves as a dispenser of chauvinism to this day.

On the occasion of the death of Uri Zvi Greenberg, probably the most revered Israeli Zionist poet, the *Jerusalem Post* took the deceased under its protection against charges of mysticism and racism. And in so doing, noted admiringly that to him "Hebrew was not just another language, but a holy tongue".¹ It is these manipulations with "holy" Hebrew, these attempts to raise it above all other languages, that are objectionable. The nationalist megalomania of the Zionists, as we see, extends to linguistics too.

In attempts to make Soviet Jews take a special attitude towards Hebrew, international Zionism has these far-reaching aims: to implant Jewish bourgeois nationalism in their minds, and to prepare them "properly" for going to Israel, where Hebrew has been made the official language.

But that is bound to fail—and not only in the Soviet

¹ *The Jerusalem Post*, May 10, 1981.

Union, but also in the West. Because a language cannot be imposed on people. If use of a language does not follow from economic needs, it will never take root.

Still, to restore the truth I most categorically declare that Hebrew is not banned in the USSR. It is taught in Moscow University's Institute of Asian and African Studies, and the universities of Tbilisi and Leningrad. Being a language of the Jewish faith, Hebrew is freely used in synagogues and studied in the yeshiva, the Jewish religious school run by the Moscow Synagogue.

The "linguistic exposures" of anti-Sovieteers are also applied to Yiddish, the living language of the Jewish masses, and that is doubly pharisaic. Because, first, the Zionists treat Yiddish with contempt, limiting its use to give freer play to "holy" Hebrew, and, second, because they know perfectly well that everywhere in the Diaspora Jews mostly speak the language of the country they live in rather than Yiddish. So when the self-proclaimed champions of Soviet Jews yell at their anti-Soviet gatherings in the USA, Britain, France, Belgium, and elsewhere, that Yiddish should be "revived" in the Soviet Union, they do so in English or French, or some other language, because most Western Zionists do not know a word of Yiddish themselves.

Victor Malka, an anti-Sovieteer of the first order, maintains that the Soviet Union "has done everything to strangle Soviet Jewry" culturally and, among other things, by having "banished" Yiddish literature. Yet in that same book, Malka says that the domain of Yiddish nowadays is steadily shrinking.¹

This is borne out, the writer says, by the continuous decline of the Yiddish press that had once been strong, but today numbers only a few publications. The decline is felt equally in the United States and Israel, France and Britain.

It follows that in the Soviet Union Yiddish is being "strangled", while in the West it is withering away by itself. Still, it is incomprehensible (unless we look at things through pharisaic nationalist eyes) why Yiddish is being "destroyed by the authorities" in the Soviet Union, where

¹ Robert Aron, André Neher, Victor Malka, *Le Judaïsme. Hier-Demain*, Ed. Buchet/Chastel, Paris, 1977, pp. 206, 213.

the journal *Sovietisch Heimland* and the newspaper *Birobidjaner Stern* appear regularly, whereas in all the capitalist countries, where only a few Yiddish periodicals have survived, this decline is not blamed on anyone in particular. Yet the "culprit" everywhere in the Diaspora is the same: the assimilation of Jews with the peoples they live among, so that Yiddish is gradually replaced by the languages of these peoples (something Zionists curse, but something that is objective and progressive). This applies equally to Jews in the Soviet Union and those in the United States. And to ascribe forcible actions to the Soviet Union is to spurn elementary logic.

A few words about Jewish schools in the Soviet Union. At one time there had been quite a few—a fact that could be traced to a tangible need: the Jewish population that had only just been delivered from the tsarist Jewish pale spoke mostly Yiddish, with the result that most Jewish children, if they were to get an education, had to be taught in that language. The Soviet authorities saw to it that there should be preparatory and secondary schools in Yiddish. Yet fifteen to twenty years passed, and these schools had fewer and fewer pupils because the natural and progressive process of convergence had brought Jews closer to the peoples in whose midst they lived, with whom they became ever more closely integrated. Jewish parents wanted their children to go to Russian, Ukrainian, or Byelorussian schools. This point is reflected in a book that was published simultaneously in New York and London, though not quite precisely. "It may sound paradoxical," it says, "but it is a fact: Jewish mothers closed the Jewish schools (in the USSR—*Ed.*)."¹ You see, not the Soviet authorities, but Jewish mothers. What is not precise here is that it was not paradoxical at all, because assimilation is not a deviation from standard.

THE BIBLICAL SMOKESCREEN

The inventions about the Jewish national culture being "rooted out" in the USSR are compounded with howls

¹ Horace B. Davis, *Toward a Marxist Theory of Nationalism*, Monthly Review Press, New York and London, 1978, p. 118.

about the "suppression" of the Jewish religion which bourgeois ideologists regard as the foundation of that culture. Their attitude may be reduced to the following: there is no Jewish culture and, what is more, there are no Jews without the biblical Jehovah who had "chosen the Jewish people" to attain the "messianic aim of humanity's salvation" and had given them the "promised land"; no "truly Jewish" spiritual life can exist in the absence of these "fundamental" concepts, and since the Soviet Union does not acknowledge the "chosen" status of the Jews, since it does not see them as "bearers of the messianic spirit" and refuses to reckon with their alleged leaning for "the sacred Zion", it thereby creates an anti-Semitic atmosphere that makes Jews incompatible with socialist society.

As we see, the ideological arsenal of the Judaic religion is called into play to justify the ludicrous idea that Jews cannot fit into socialism. This programme, which the false champions of Soviet Jews would like them to accept, is a call to return to the Middle Ages.

Not only Zionists but also those bourgeois groups that support them owing to their identical anti-Soviet views, have adopted the same posture. Take the influential *Monde*, the Paris newspaper, which has raised a whole set of charges against the Soviet Union in an article entitled, "The Cultural Struggle of Jews in the Soviet Union".¹ The article revolves essentially around "the need for saving" the Judaic religion, for it alone can meet the cultural needs of Soviet Jews.

The Soviet authorities, the author of the article says, are determined to squash the wish of the Jews to be "unlike the others". They insist that Jews abandon "the customs of their ancestors" and accept the culture of the land. Mixed marriages have increased in number as a result, while those who practice religious rites are becoming fewer, though according to Judaic tradition, the synagogue is the centre of community life. In this setting, the paper says, Jews have difficulty in obtaining skullcaps, which, once they acquire them, are hidden under fur

¹ *Le Monde Dimanche*, March 14, 1982.

hats. And where, the paper asks with affected concern, can a Soviet Jew obtain *kosher* meat?

It is not likely that the editors did not know that the synagogue has long since ceased to be a centre of Jewish community life—and this not only in the Soviet Union but also in France. Surely they are aware, too, that mixed marriages are not rare in France either. If they are not aware of it, let them look up a book published in Paris: “Numerous are the leaders of the Jewish community in France . . . who are married to non-Jews, regardless of their being or not being converted,”¹ it says. This is a personal observation of Jacob Tsur, a former Israeli ambassador to Paris.

When one sees a French Zionist leader married to a Catholic calling on Soviet Jews to beware of the “deadly threat” of assimilation; when one hears that Zionist champions of “tradition” in the West attack assimilation (to which they, too, are subject); and when one observes the bourgeois media lamenting over the lot of Soviet Jews who have turned their backs on the ideological garbage of the Middle Ages, one cannot help arriving at the conclusion that there is no limit to the hypocrisy of the Zionists and their supporters.

Do most French Jews wear a skullcap—in the open or under their hats? Do they eat nothing but *kosher*? Certainly not. Soviet Jews, however, “should” do so, but “cannot”, for the authorities “forbid it”.

To believe anti-Sovieteer Victor Malka, the “suppression” of pious Jews in the Soviet Union has reached a point where they are forbidden to have “either rabbis or synagogues”. Obviously, the gentleman has never been to the Soviet Union. If he should come one day, he will have no trouble finding the road to the local synagogue in Moscow, Leningrad, Kiev and dozens of other Soviet cities. And there he will see rabbis in the flesh.

Malka notes that Judaism “is retreating step by step under the impact of industrial civilisation, retaining only

¹ Quoted from R. Aron, A. Neher, V. Malka, *op. cit.*, p. 206.

a few little islands".¹ It does so everywhere save for the Soviet Union, where, one would think, industrialisation is non-existent and the setbacks of Judaism are not due to its gradual decline under the influence of the changing society, but to "administrative bans". Again the double standard of the Zionist anti-Sovieters rivals their lack of logic. The authors of the book we have quoted, clerical Zionist Robert Aron (a deceased member of the French Academy not to be confused with a no less rabid anti-communist, and also deceased, Raymond Aron), Victor Malka and André Neher are at odds with logic, too, when they deplore that Jews of the Diaspora have renounced biblical names willed them by their fathers. In fact, however, the first of these gentlemen is called Robert, and the other two are Victor and André. Need I prove that these names were not willed them by their fathers, but "imposed" by their assimilation.

That is something Zionists cannot evade: the convergence of Jews with the peoples they live with (like the convergence of any other ethnic community), is beneficial and necessary, provided it is voluntary and not based on privilege.

In no industrially advanced country will anyone ever again be able to clothe Jews in long kaftans, make them wear skullcaps, put Talmudic books into their hands, and drive them into the musty confines of synagogues. This would be a futile undertaking even in the capitalist environment, and doubly so in the case of the Jewish population of the socialist Soviet Union.

But let's look again at the charges that the Soviet authorities are rooting out Judaism forcibly. *Israel and Palestine*, a progressive journal published in English in Paris, reported that rabbis in the USA are confounded by the reluctance of former Soviet Jews, who have come to the United States, to attend services in synagogues.² It follows that as long as these people lived in the Soviet Union they yearned passionately to attend services at synagogues, but did not dare

¹ R. Aron, A. Neher, V. Malka, *op. cit.*, p. 196.

² *Israel and Palestine*, Paris, January-February (No. 46), 1976.

approach them for fear of the authorities. Then, on obtaining unrestricted access to the seats of Judaic mysticism and superstition, they evade them. This is doubly strange because in the West to be known as pious is a good thing. Is this not evidence that even among Jews who left the Soviet Union (and those are the Jews more likely to have religious prejudices), the call of the synagogue is much weaker than their Zionist "deliverers" would wish. And, certainly, the attachment to "the faith of their fathers" is incomparably weaker among Jews who have no intention of abandoning their true and only Soviet Motherland. This is not due to administrative obstacles allegedly raised by "godless authorities", but to a profound decline of the Judaic religion, and this not only in the Soviet Union.

A conference in Jerusalem in March 1983 demanded that the Soviet Union should "put an end to the persecution of Jews who wish to practice the religion of their fathers". This demand is groundless and false. Mind you, the conference was conceived to promote fraternisation on anti-Soviet grounds of the world's most vehement reactionaries—the Zionist leaders and Ronald Reagan and Margaret Thatcher, who sent messages of support to the gathering attended by ultra-conservative rabbis and extreme right-wing practitioners of Christian clericalism. Reporting the event, the bourgeois press did not miss the opportunity to lament the "unbearable" lot of pious Jews in the Soviet Union.

Wherever Judaic clericals make no direct anti-Soviet attacks, their theological exercises are still hostile to socialism and the Soviet way of life. This applies above all to commentaries of the dogma that Jews are God's chosen people and to the teaching about the Messiah. These important elements of the Judaic faith are theologically backed by the Zionist "idea" that there is a "Jewish nation of all the world".

It is easily seen that only one step leads from the biblical dogma about the chosen people to the racist invention of an "extraterritorial worldwide Jewish nation" with no precedent in history. And since that "nation" encompasses all Jews, those of them who are citizens of the Soviet

Union are "detached" from the Soviet people, that great community to which they really belong, and are "turned over" to a fancied "Jewish nation" that includes the cut-throats of terrorist rabbi Meir Kahane.

When clerical André Neher says Abraham had been the "first Jew and Zionist" and the Messiah will be the "ultimate Zionist", with all the Jews between Abraham and Messiah being Judaists and Zionists, and bearers of the "Messianic spirit"¹, this is clearly meant to create the illusion of unity and to identify the Soviet Jew, an internationalist and atheist, on the one hand, and Neher himself, Baron Rothschild, and Yitzhak Shamir, on the other.

These vain attempts to assert an illusory "Jewish unity" and rally the "world Jewry", including Soviet Jews, round Israel, is one of the reasons why Zionists exploit the unifying principle of the "ancestral faith".

The hopes pinned on Judaism are explained by Nadav Safran, a Zionist ideologue and Harvard professor. He writes: "Israelis (read: Israeli Zionists and clericals—*Ed.*) sense that community of religion, be it formal, passive, and even merely negative, is the link between them and the Jews in the rest of the world."² Yet what could a negative community of religion, vague and contradictory as it is, really mean? It means that a Jew who looks down on any religion, including Judaism, an atheist in other words, is also tied (through the Judaism which he rejects) to Israel and "all Jews of the world". It is dire necessity that makes Zionists rely on such "community", which is said to unite those who recognise religion and those who do not.

Judaic manipulations are often meant to whip up anti-Sovietism, to isolate Soviet Jews from the nations and nationalities among which they live, to eradicate feelings of Soviet patriotism among Jews living in the USSR. These designs are as perfidious as they are futile: to seek the aid of the Judaic religion, which is in deep crisis, is worthy

¹ André Neher, *Clefs pour le Judaïsme*, Seghers, Paris, 1977, pp. 9-13.

² Nadav Safran, *Israel—the Embattled Ally*, Belknap Press, Cambridge, Mass., 1978, p. 208.

of totally bankrupt politicians, who thereby betray the shabbiness of their ideological equipment.

However lamentable this may be for champions of the Talmudic culture, it is on the wane everywhere in the Diaspora, and the process is irreversible because it is an objective expression of the incompatibility of Judaism with the spiritual needs of people in the space age.

FALSE SIGNS OF EQUALITY

Zionists declare opposition to the ideology and political practice of Zionism in the Soviet Union a "sign of anti-Semitism". Indeed, anyone who ventures to criticise the Zionist doctrine or the adventurist policy of Israel's rulers, is quickly dubbed an anti-Semite. Zionist logic is truly inimitable, and Zionist hypocrisy truly unique.

Could it be that these men are unaware of the many Jews who have been opposing Zionism since the day it came into being? No, they are aware of them. And those Jews, too, are named anti-Semites and, moreover, "traitors".

In the Soviet Union, anti-Sovieteers maintain, anti-Zionist propaganda blends with anti-Semitism because the two million Soviet Jews are accused of being "Zionism's fifth column".¹ Need I prove what most literate and impartial people already know: Communists distinguish between the concepts Jew, Judaist, and Zionist. To say every Jew, especially a Soviet citizen, gravitates towards Zionism, is no more right than to accuse every non-Jew of anti-Semitism. This view, not subject to any here-and-now considerations, is clearly in evidence among Soviet authors.

But Zionists pretend to know nothing of this Marxist-Leninist attitude. William Korey, Director of the United Nations Office of the International Council of B'nai B'rith, who is considered to be the leading United States expert on the problems of Soviet Jewry has, however, gone so far as to liken a newspaper item criticising Judaism and Zionism to, of all things, a Jewish pogrom. The charge was

¹ *Le Figaro*, April 15, 1985.

levelled at *Molodezh Moldavii*, a Kishinev newspaper. Korey pretends to be furious over the fact that such an article appeared in Kishinev, a city which experienced the infamous pogrom of 1903.¹ Yet the American Zionist failed to recall that the man behind the Kishinev pogrom, tsarist Minister of the Interior Vyacheslav Pleve, a ferocious anti-Semite, had not, despite Zionist "logic", been an anti-Zionist. On the contrary, he favoured Zionism. Which is borne out by his meeting (already after the pogrom) with Theodor Herzl, the founder of political Zionism, at which the two hammered out mutual understanding. His class intuition did not fail to tell the tsarist minister that Zionism, which sought to divert working Jews from revolutionary struggle, to lead them away to the foothills of Zion, was liable to render a priceless service to counter-revolutionaries and to those anti-Semites thirsting to get rid of the Jews. This is eloquent proof that anti-Semitism can go along with Zionism, but not with anti-Zionism, as Korey would have us believe.

Zvi Gitelman, a leading ideologue of modern-day Zionism, is a little more pliable. He is aware that branding opponents of Zionism as anti-Semites has lost credibility. He admits that one can criticise Israel and Zionism without being an anti-Semite. But he hastens to add that this does not apply to the Soviet Union, because anti-Zionist propaganda there is directed against Jews, and Soviet writers see no difference between Orthodox Jews, Zionists, and Jews in general.

Gitelman takes issue with this author, too, complaining that my article, "Zionist Battlers for the Truth", which appeared in *Nauka i religia* (No. 1, 1973), failed to negate the connection between Judaism and Zionism. My opponent picked on the following lines in the article: "It is clear to any unprejudiced person that the great majority of Jews . . . have long broken with Judaism. . . The great majority of labouring Jews . . . decisively condemn Zionism but still

¹ William Korey, *The Soviet Cage. Anti-Semitism in Russia*, Viking Press, New York, 1973, p. 161.

remain Jews" (I have left the three dots where Gitelman put them).¹

I cannot deny my American critic the right to put three dots to single out the points I made in my article. Neither can I deny him the right to leave out my statement in the very same paragraph that the Zionist trick of identifying the concepts Jew, Judaism, and Zionism, is dishonest and primitive, that scientifically Judaism and Zionism are not the same thing.

For if confusing these concepts does not suit (which I have reason to doubt) the American protester against "Soviet anti-Semitism", he should take issue not with Soviet authors, but with his confederates. Take the following statements: "We need not call meetings with their inevitably profuse talk, to propagate our ideas, for such propaganda will be part of religious services"; "the Bible is our mandate"; "there is no difference between the Jewish religion and Jewish nationalism", and, "Zionism is concentrated Judaism". These statements do not belong to Soviet authors, but respectively to Theodor Herzl, David Ben-Gurion, Golda Meir, and a conspicuous ideologist of present-day Zionism, Paul Ziniewsky.

As for Marxist scholars, though they oppose unscientific attempts at identifying the concepts Jew, Judaist and Zionist, they never go to the other extreme of saying that these are totally isolated from each other. While most Jews are not Zionists, Zionists, after all, are Jews, and Zionism is a Jewish and not any other bourgeois nationalism. Likewise, though the majority of Jews in the modern-day world are essentially atheistic and cannot be considered practicing Judaism (as the Zionist clerical "science" would have us believe), the majority of Judaists are Jews. Nor should we overlook the fact that Zionists in the West and in Israel, along with Judaic clericals, exploit the biblical myth so assiduously that it is mostly impossible to distinguish between secular Zionist ideologists and Judaic theologians.

That is why Mr. Gitelman will never see us denying the connection between Judaism and Zionism. I repeat: those

¹ *Problems of Communism*, January-February, 1980.

two things are not identical. But there is no wall between them, and they cannot be criticised in total isolation from each other.

If the American anti-Sovieteer has forgotten that Zionist leaders did not fence these concepts off from each other, his loss of memory is certainly not physiological but rather of a political nature. Because it is his purpose to create the impression that Jews, Zionists and Judaists are all one for Soviet scholars. Why? Because, I suppose (since there is no room in Soviet society for Zionism or any other variety of bourgeois nationalism), Gitelman wants his readers to believe that in the Soviet Union the Hebrew religion, being equated to Zionism, is outlawed. What Mr. Gitelman wants to say thereby is that Soviet Jews are in an "unbearable situation", because in the Soviet Union they are regarded as Judaists and Zionists.

In the spring of 1981, neo-Nazis held a procession in Southfield, a little American town. A few dozen thugs in Nazi uniforms with swastika armbands, marched through its streets shouting anti-Semitic obscenities. Has this any connection with Gitelman's line of reasoning? I would say it has: Southfield is in Michigan. And Zvi Gitelman, who is a professor at Michigan University, would have spared himself a lot of trouble if he was really eager to fight anti-Semitism to look in his own backyard rather than the Soviet society, which is imbued with the spirit of socialist internationalism.

Take this other point. Zionist cutthroats of the Jewish Defence League in the United States have been committing terrorist acts against Soviet diplomats, performers and actors, the Aeroflot agency, and so on, for more than fifteen years. This is a long enough time to test the self-control and political awareness, the ideological and moral maturity, and the strength of spirit, of Soviet people. If there had been anti-Semitism in the Soviet Union, if Jews and Zionists were identified, there should have been an anti-Jewish reaction, and a sharp one, against these barbarian acts. Such a reaction would be sure to occur in any bourgeois country if its citizens working or touring abroad were so systematically persecuted by Zionist stormtroopers. Not

so in the socialist Soviet Union. Zionists cannot cite a single case in which a Soviet Jew was molested in retaliation to the outrageous behaviour of Zionist terrorists in the USA. Because in the Soviet Union these gangsters are not confused with Jewish citizens of the Soviet Union or, indeed, with the mass of Jews living in Israel, the United States, and any other capitalist country. This is convincing evidence that the social roots of anti-Semitism have really been destroyed in the Soviet Union—and that this is no newspaper propaganda, as anti-Sovieteers make out.

Zionism is judged in the Soviet Union by strictly class-governed criteria. Criticism of the Zionists is not directed against either Soviet Jews or labouring Jews in the capitalist world, including Israel. What is more, it is consistent with the true, correctly conceived, interests of the Jews.

“That the Soviet Union is not against the existence of Israel as an independent state,” Andrei Gromyko said at a New York press conference in June 1982, “is a well-known fact. Far from being against it, the Soviet Union holds that Israel must exist as an independent state. But we are against an aggressive Israeli state. We hold that Israel can have good relations with its neighbours, both near and far, as a peaceable state. We do not believe that its positions can be lasting if it will be at daggers drawn with its neighbours, that is, the Arab and other countries”.

Zionist ideologists exploit the false idea that every Jew is (or should be) a Zionist and a devotee of the policies of Israel's rulers. That is why they view any anti-Zionist utterance, any rejection of the reckless policy of Israel's Zionist leaders, as “anti-Jewish”.

Soviet people reject Zionism as firmly as they reject anti-Semitism. Zionism is an entirely false and reactionary ideology. This Lenin pointed out years ago. Anti-Semitism, too, is foul propagation of racial exclusiveness and national hostility working in the interest of the exploiting classes. The above, too, was noted by Lenin.¹ This equal intole-

¹ V. I. Lenin, “The Position of the Bund in the Party”, *Collected Works*, Vol. 7, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1974, p. 99.

rance of two equally repulsive and harmful social evils is a characteristic feature of the outlook of any Soviet person faithful to Lenin's ideas.

Communism and Zionism are poles apart. This means that irreconcilable struggle between them is inevitable due to their class incompatibility, their political rejection of each other, and not to anti-Semitism, which no Marxist-Leninist would ever tolerate.

And one more important point. Not only Zionism is criticised in the Soviet Union, and not only the aggressive policy of Israel's rulers, but also all other anti-people, imperialist doctrines and currents, and, likewise, any and all aggressive attacks. We see US imperialism, the main culprit of the bloodshed in Africa, the Middle East, and Central America, as the chief global force of modern-day reaction. Zionism is no more than its henchman. We in the Soviet Union reject it as we do the South African racists and the bloodstained juntas in Latin America. The Zionist invasion of Lebanon was denounced as angrily by Soviet people as the dirty war of the US imperialists in Vietnam, their piratical aggression against Grenada, the Falklands venture of the British conservatives, and South Africa's criminal incursions into Angola.

Only hopelessly narrow-minded philistines or out-and-out political gangsters can describe exposure of Zionism and of the predatory conduct of the Israeli leadership as acts of anti-Semitism. Soviet people have no sympathy for racist and man-hating ideas, for anti-communist slanderers, and instigators of armed adventures. All of these merit equal contempt and strong resistance.

AN EZEKIEL CALLING DOWN DOOM

Zionists and their henchmen are continuing their attacks on Soviet home policy, and exploiting the "Jewish question" which has long since been resolved in the Soviet Union. At the same time, they fling mud at the Soviet foreign policy. To be sure, it would have been unnatural if

strident Zionist voices had not been heard in the chorus howling about a Soviet military threat.

True, differences do occur in the Zionist camp over "concrete" effects of the "Soviet threat". In May 1981, for example, Menachem Begin, who was then Premier of Israel, said without batting an eyelid that Soviet military advisers were active in Lebanon. Israeli generals, however, refuted this lie. Former chief of military intelligence Chaim Herzog (now President of Israel), too, laughed down Begin's invention. But the head of government, undaunted, repeated his malicious tale. Whereupon Abba Eban, former Foreign Minister, intervened and rapped Begin for his grotesque allegation, aimed at buttressing his position in the elections. Eban added it was ludicrous to say Soviet military advisers were in Lebanon while their presence has not been confirmed by either Israeli or Western sources.¹

The Zionists are using the lie of a Soviet threat to frighten the Arabs. An Israeli newspaper maintained that by backing the Palestinians, the Soviet Union was pursuing the "obvious" aim of seizing control over Arab oilfields; the "naïve" Arabs did not see that the Palestinians were a tool of the Soviet Union, which wanted to capture predominance in their countries. "The danger," a Zionist sheet writes, "is not the result of the Arab-Jewish conflict, but that of the actions of a socialist country (the USSR, of course—*Ed.*), which is the initiator of that conflict."²

The poor "simple-minded" Arab leaders fighting off the Israeli aggression are said to have no inkling of the "hand of Moscow" prompting the Israelis to capture large Arab territories; that same hand was now hindering the Zionists to withdraw their troops. These leaders, the Zionists would have us believe, are benighted mortals who do not know that Soviet paratroopers are about to swoop down upon Arab towns and oilfields any minute.

What of it that the Rapid Deployment Force, designed for intervening in the oil-producing countries of the Middle East, is maintained by the United States, not the Soviet

¹ *The Jerusalem Post*, May 28, 1981.

² *Viata noastră* (Tel Aviv), February 20 and March 27, 1981.

Union? What of it if even the most inventive anti-Sovieteer cannot name a single Arab oil derrick which the Soviet Union ever tried to seize, and no Arab country in which the Soviet Union appropriated even an inch of soil? Nor would they be able to provide the slightest evidence that the Soviet Union is planning to do so in the future.

On the other hand, recall a few indisputable facts. At the time it was occupying the Sinai Peninsula, Israel pumped Arab oil from there for all it was worth, and would have continued if the Camp David deal, which it thought more profitable, had not intervened. To this day, Israel is maintaining unlawful control over Arab lands. And in the summer of 1982, blessed by its American patrons who have made Israel their outpost in the Middle East and are supplying it steadily with arms, it invaded Lebanon and committed monstrous genocide against Lebanese and Palestinians. Having done so, it attributes aggressive intents to the Soviet Union! That is a ploy ultimately aimed at distracting the Arabs from the struggle against the Israeli aggression.

Here is how one of the most ferocious Israeli hawks, former Defence Minister Ariel Sharon, of whom Begin once said he might one fine day put tanks round the Premier's residence, sees the "Soviet threat": he holds that a threat of Soviet expansion exists in three regions—Europe, Middle East, and Africa. In Europe, he amplifies, the Palestine Liberation Organisation is setting the stage for Soviet penetration by backing terrorist movements. As Sharon sees it, these movements are all in the pay of the Soviet Union.

But take this other statement of Sharon's. The super-hawk, who has lost touch with reality, described his attitude in the Italian press: Israel must maintain its own security not through accords with neighbouring countries, but by extending its strategic interests to Turkey, Pakistan, Iran, the Persian Gulf and Africa, especially Northern and Central Africa. Sharon declared that in all these regions Israel reserved the right of intervening, and wished all interested countries, the international public, to know this.

Certainly, it is a good thing for the world to know the

truth about the appetites of the Zionist expansionists. They spurn even the commandments of God, who gave the chosen people far less territory—none but the land from the Nile to the Euphrates.

Despite this, the Begin-Sharon-Shamir clique accuses the Soviet Union of expansionism—in Europe, Africa, and the Middle East, though, of course, it cannot provide a single proof of the Soviet Union appropriating an inch of alien territory.

All Zionist political designs are promptly provided biblical “substantiation” by their clerical supporters (not only Judaic but also frequently Christian). The Soviet threat lie is no exception.

Take the fanatically pro-Zionist American writers, Thomas S. McCall and Zola Levitt. They claim in their book, *The Coming Russian Invasion of Israel*, that Russia would any minute attack that country. How did they know? They learned it from the Bible. It had been predicted by prophet Ezekiel two thousand six hundred years ago. Where, in Ezekiel’s book does it say anything of a Russian invasion? Well, take Chapter 38:2, which speaks of Gog and Magog, the rulers of Mesech and Tubal. Certainly, but what has the Soviet Union to do with it? It has, the two writers claim, because Gog and Magog were identified with Russia long before it established its present status, and the reference to Mesech and Tubal (Moscow and Tobolsk) is a clear sign that this is true.¹

To be sure, Mesech and Tubal could no less credibly be identified with, say, Madrid and Toledo, but that would not serve the purpose of maligning the Soviet Union.

Should we waste time on examining such cant, the reader may ask. Let us reply by citing Lenin. “Simply to close one’s eyes, not only to bourgeois science, but even to the most absurd doctrine, up to and including extreme obscurantism”, he wrote, “is, of course, undoubtedly harmful”.²

¹ Thomas S. McCall, Zola Levitt, *The Coming Russian Invasion of Israel*, Verlag Hermann Schulte Wetzlar, Chicago, 1974, pp. 25-26.

² V. I. Lenin, “Uncritical Criticism”, *Collected Works*, Vol. 3, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1917, p. 632.

Fortunately, Zionists and their accomplices do not hold undivided sway in the political and ideological domains of the capitalist world. World progressives, including the democratic forces in Israel, acknowledge the Soviet Union's sincere interest in buttressing peace throughout the world, including the Middle East. As the Soviet Union sees it, for true peace to come to the Middle East, the Israeli occupation of Arab territories captured in 1967 must be terminated, the Arab people of Palestine must be allowed to exercise their right to having their own state, and the security and sovereignty of all states in the region, including Israel's, must be properly ensured.

Peaceful coexistence of the Middle East countries, as in the rest of the world, mutual respect among peoples living in that long-suffering region, consolidating the independence and sovereignty of all of them without exception, and practising the principle of non-interference in internal affairs—that is what the Soviet Union ceaselessly advocates, acting on Lenin's foreign policy principles.

THE FRUITS OF IGNORANCE

Glance at one more side of Zionist anti-Sovietism. Marxists-Leninists and Zionists, whose ideological platforms are irreconcilable, may be expected to agree that any researcher or journalist, whatever his beliefs, should know the subject he is writing about. He may be pardoned for not knowing some secondary details, but there is no excuse if he betrays elementary ignorance of the social phenomena he has set out to examine.

Zionist and pro-Zionist writers, however, all too often lack due knowledge of history, sociology, geography, and so on. Here is a case of "Soviet anti-Semitism" as described by a Zionist publication: a Christian school-leaver was not admitted to university for the sole reason that he was thought to be Jewish. His mother was forced to obtain papers proving the family's Christian background.¹

Yet no Soviet higher educational establishment has ever

¹ *Viata noastră*, February 5, 1981.

required applicants to prove anything of the sort. And an anti-Sovieteer, no matter how fanatical, if not totally ignorant and exceptionally dense, should have known that no one could have asked for, or issued, or presented such proof, because in the Soviet Union the church has been separated from the state, and reference to anyone's relation to any religion is totally ruled out.

The Zionists writing for the paper have probably had no first-hand knowledge of Soviet realities. But Italian journalist Alfonso Sterpellone has criss-crossed the Soviet Union as Moscow correspondent of the *Messaggero*. We could expect, therefore, that he would not distort the picture of our way of life. But, alas. Where Sterpellone says, for example, that "it is in the Kremlin's interest" to reduce the number of Jews in the country as quickly as possible, we see nothing but a common anti-Soviet invention. But it is a blend of ignorance and malice on his part to say that in the case of children born of mixed marriages, with one of the parents being Jewish, the authorities give it the nationality that comprises the majority in the locality concerned (in other words, if the child is born in the Ukraine it is all but forced to become a Ukrainian, and if in Uzbekistan—to be an Uzbek). It is a well-known fact, after all, that in the USSR when first getting a passport, young people freely choose between the nationality of either one of their parents.

Then came ignorance pure and simple. Contradicting his own claims, Sterpellone, who had maintained that the Kremlin wanted the least number of Jews to remain in the Soviet Union, wrote in the same breath that the authorities were seeing to it that Jews should not "conceal" their nationality. But, he added, the authorities were not equally vigilant in different places: choice of nationality in the 1970 census, he wrote, was eased because identification papers were not properly checked in the Russian Federation and the Central Asian republics, whereas the checks in Byelorussia and the Ukraine had been extremely strict.¹

¹ Alfonso Sterpellone, *L'assedio di Israele*, Pan Editrice, Milan, 1973, pp. 124-125.

We are told that identification papers in Byelorussia and the Ukraine were most thoroughly checked because there were more Jews there, and less thoroughly elsewhere, because there were fewer Jews. But millions of Soviet people will testify that identification papers were not checked at all (either thoroughly or otherwise) in the censuses of 1959, 1970, and 1979. Interviewers were categorically forbidden to ask for or look into any papers, even if someone should produce them on his or her own initiative. Everything was taken down by word of mouth—in the Ukraine, Moldavia, Yakutia, Sakhalin, and every other place in the country. Any in the least expert Sovietologist should have known this.

And one more case. Certainly, we do not think Sovietologists must know everything about the smaller Soviet towns. But any “respectable” Sovietologist should have some idea about the capitals of the fifteen Union republics. Yet the *Jerusalem Post* refers to Kishinev as a Ukrainian town,¹ while, if it wished to check this in *The Jewish World*, a colourful manual published in London, it would learn that once upon a time Kishinev was part of Russia and that now (that is, in the late 1970s, when the above book appeared) it was, of all things, part of Romania.² Every child in the Soviet Union knows that Kishinev is the capital of Moldavia, which is one of the fifteen republics of the Soviet Union.

If any writer in the Soviet Union betrayed such geographical ignorance (or irresponsibility), the doors of editorial offices and publishers would be shut for him. But the “free world” is “free” precisely because every writer may, among other things, freely publish falsehoods and falsifications or impart knowledge that he does not himself have. As a result, ignorance is one of the sources of Zionist, or any other, anti-Sovietism.

But the main content of the Zionist variety of anti-Sovietism is not arbitrary. It is shaped by deep-going class-oriented factors. They repose on the hostility of Jewish capitalists (like all other capitalists) towards socialism and

¹ *The Jerusalem Post*, May 28, 1981.

² *The Jewish World*, Thames and Hudson, London, 1979, p. 287.

revolutionary change, which they regard as a deadly menace. Abolition of exploitative relations and private property in the Soviet Union and, following its example, in many other countries—that is what breeds the bitter hatred of capitalists and prompts them to engage in acts of ideological diversion against the Soviet Union.

Zionist leaders know that Zionism cannot exist in a socialist society. Hence their blind hatred of the socialist system, which leads them to reckless and senseless political and ideological ventures.

The rulers of Israel and the Zionists campaign against the Soviet Union not only in Israel, but everywhere in the world. The Israeli government and the Zionists also resent the fact that the Soviet Union is a champion of peace and of the rights of nations, that it opposes the Israeli occupation of Arab territories, and supports the lawful rights of the Arab people of Palestine. Yet the Zionist slanderers who attack the gains of socialism and the fraternal friendship that prevails among the peoples of the Soviet Union, have failed to make any political capital out of it. The Zionists' anti-Soviet slanders are rejected by all decent people in the world, including progressive Jews in the West and in Israel.

L. Dadiani

ZIONISM AND THE SOCIAL-DEMOCRATIC MOVEMENT

ZIONISM AND THE PARTIES OF THE SECOND INTERNATIONAL

Soon after the founding of the World Zionist Organisation (WZO) in 1897, some of its leaders set out to "merge" Zionism and socialism, concealing Zionism's true class essence with "socialist" rhetoric. What they wanted was to pry away labouring Jews from the revolutionary movement, to have them join Zionist organisations and feed their illusion that a specific, next to supra-class "Jewish state" was their only escape from oppression, lack of rights, and exploitation. In so doing, the Zionists were compelled to reckon with the fact that, as Zionist historian Howard Morley Sachar admits, "Marxian socialism . . . proved to be the principal magnet for politically minded Jews".¹

The founding of various "workers" and "socialist" Zionist organisations was not the result of the Jewish working people accepting Zionist dogmas or of any major Zionist success in the labour movement (for most Jewish proletarians rejected and combatted Zionism). It rather amounted to a response and adaptation by part of the Zionist leaders to the criticism of revolutionary Social-Democrats.

By professing to be Socialists and "champions of proletarian interests," left-wing Zionist leaders sought to extend Zionism's basis and, indeed, win allies in the working-class and trade-union movements in Europe and America.

Theories of so-called Zionist socialism surfaced at the end of the 19th and early 20th centuries, followed by the founding of various pseudo-socialist Zionist organisations.

¹ Howard Morley Sachar, *The Course of Modern Jewish History*, Delta Books, New York, 1958, p. 288.

The main point in these theories was that a Jewish state must be a socialist state.

Prior to World War I, the Second International considered Zionism and all its varieties, including Zionist socialism and proletarian Zionism, a bourgeois nationalist ideology. This was the view of the revolutionary Marxist wing in the Second International, and also, with some deviations and vacillations, the view of the centrists and of even the candidly social-reformist right wing.

Though the Social-Democrats of those days regarded the Zionists, and especially the Zionist socialist parties, as ideological and political adversaries, only the consistently proletarian revolutionaries headed by Lenin, who made no concessions whatsoever to nationalism and opportunism, considered it important to combat Zionism and to resist Zionist attempts to infiltrate the working-class movement.

Lenin and his followers fought anti-Semitism, on the one hand, and Zionism, on the other. They demonstrated Zionism's reactionary essence as a bourgeois nationalist ideology that had nothing in common with either socialism or the national liberation movement.

Shortly before the international socialist congress in Stuttgart (August 16-24, 1907), the Zionist Socialist Workers' Party¹ applied to the Russian Social-Democratic Workers' Party for admission to the social-democratic sub-section of the Russian section of the Second International.² The application was turned down, and, as Lenin later wrote, a resolution was adopted, "stating the reasons why *Zionists*, even though they called themselves Zionist Socialists should not be included among Social-Democrats."³

The Social-Democratic Party of the Polish and Lithuanian Kingdom, which took final shape in August 1900, also

¹ A petty-bourgeois nationalist party founded in the south of Russia at the end of 1904.

² Under the rules of the Second International, all delegates from affiliated Russian parties formed a national section.

³ V. I. Lenin, "Meeting of the International Socialist Bureau", *Collected Works*, Vol. 15, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1977, p. 242.

opposed Zionism, and other tokens of Jewish bourgeois nationalism.

Marxists-Leninists reached down to the true nature of Zionism, whatever its forms, and showed the working masses of Russia, including Jewish workers, that the leaders of the Bund (a universal Jewish workers' league in Lithuania, Poland and Russia) had a revisionist, opportunist, petty-bourgeois nationalist platform that was in some ways pro-Zionist.

Out of the social-democratic theorists of that time, Karl Kautsky, as Lenin noted on several occasions, had played a big part in propagating the Marxist view of the Jewish question and in criticising Jewish bourgeois nationalism and Zionism.¹

It will be recalled that throughout his political career, and as a scholar too, Kautsky departed from revolutionary Marxism and gradually drifted to social-reformism and social-chauvinism. After 1917 he became a bitter foe of the socialist October Revolution and the Soviet state. Some of his scholarly works, however, written when he was still a Marxist, have to varying degrees retained their importance, though, of course, not everything in them has stood the test of time. And that applies, too, to his works on the Jewish question and Zionism.

Abiding by the ideas of Marx and Engels, which he backed up with his study of the situation of Jews in various countries, Kautsky proved that Jews had not historically developed into a nation, and that in Eastern Europe they represented a survival of a medieval caste.² He criticised the Zionist postulate of an "immutable Jewish racial type", a "specific Jewish character", "racial purity", and "everlasting anti-Semitism". He showed that Zionism and anti-Semitism belonged to the same type of phenomenon, and

¹ V. I. Lenin, "Does the Jewish Proletariat Need an 'Independent Political Party'?", *Collected Works*, Vol. 6, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1977, p. 334; "The Position of the Bund in the Party", *op. cit.*, Vol. 7, 1974, p. 99.

² Among Kautsky's relevant works were *The Bloodbath in Kishinev and the Jewish Question*, *The Crisis in Austria, Nationality and Internationalism*, and *Are the Jews a Race?*

demonstrated the linkage between Zionist and Judaic dogmas. Time and again, Kautsky pointed out that the Zionist movement would result in increasing the general hostility towards the Jews.

A second revised and supplemented edition of Kautsky's book, *Are the Jews a Race?*, and articles published after the October Revolution, show that Kautsky's view of Zionism did not change with time. "Zionism," he wrote, "is simply not a progressive but a reactionary movement. It does not want to follow the necessary line of advance, and is putting spokes in the wheel of progress. It denies the right of nations to self-determination and has instead proclaimed a historical right which has by now ceased to work".

Criticising the mystical "historical right" of the Jews to Palestine, Kautsky wrote: "According to the right to labour and the right to democratic self-determination, Palestine does not belong to the Jews of Vienna or London or New York, who are claiming it for the Jewry, but to the Arabs, who make up the vast majority in that country."

Kautsky, who displayed complete incomprehension of the Great October Socialist Revolution (in *Are the Jews a Race?* as well) drew the conclusion that no exodus to strange lands can help the Jews, wherever they may wend their way, for "their destiny is most intimately tied to the [socialist] revolution".¹ To be sure, the Zionists, especially those in the Zionist "labour movement", are generally pleased with Kautsky, a rabid anti-communist and father of the theory of "democratic socialism". Only one thing displeases them about him, and that is his anti-Zionism. Hence the charges that he did not know or understand the Jewish question, and the attacks against his "assimilationism", "dogmatism", even "anti-Semitism". The same criticism resounded also against many other prominent Social-Democrats of the past (many of Jewish origin) who thought Zionism was incompatible with socialism, namely, Georgy Plekhanov, Victor and Friedrich Adler, Otto Bauer,

¹ See Karl Kautsky, *Rasse und Yudentum* (Race and Jewry). Stuttgart, 1921.

L. Martov (Zederbaum), Herman Lieberman, and others.

The fallacious idealistic, reformist, and social-nationalist views on the national question attributed to Otto Bauer, chief of the Austro-Marxists, have long since been refuted by Marxist-Leninist scholars, and I see no need in going into them here. The few essentially correct ideas in Bauer's *National Question and Social-Democracy* are associated with his interpretation of the "Jewish nation" and Jewish assimilation. Though inconsistent and confused, as Lenin noted, Bauer had been correct in these respects.¹ In other respects, however, he was prone to err.

Before World War I, Zionism had failed to win official recognition in the international social-democratic movement.² But, backed by some social-reformist leaders and acting above all through its pseudo-socialist parties and organisations, it penetrated into the midst of Jewish working people, contaminating them with its chauvinist nationalist ideology. Along with other nationalists, the Zionist pseudo-socialists divided and weakened the working-class movement, and fought against the internationalist revolutionary wing of the social-democratic movement, notably the Bolsheviks.

In some countries (tsarist Russia, Austria-Hungary, the USA, Britain, and so on), the Zionist pseudo-socialists captured bridgeheads among Jewish artisans and workers, and also established ties with social-reformist parties and trade unions. In Palestine, from the very beginning of its colonisation, Zionism had been the dominant current in the local Jewish labour movement.

Not only Zionist pseudo-socialists carried on a policy

¹ V. I. Lenin, "Notebook", *Collected Works*, Vol. 39, p. 233; "Critical Remarks on the National Question", *op. cit.*, Vol. 20, pp. 28-39; "'Cultural-National' Autonomy", *op. cit.*, Vol. 19, p. 506; "A Contribution to the History of the National Programme in Austria and in Russia", *op. cit.*, Vol. 20, p. 100.

² The International Socialist Bureau, the executive body of the Second International, had on three occasions—in 1907, 1908 and 1911—refused admission to the so-called World Jewish Socialist Labour League (Poale Zion), formed in 1907 by Poale Zion parties in a number of countries with the professed aim of "building a socialist society" in Palestine.

of dividing the Jewish workers and befogging their minds with their nationalist ideology. Bourgeois Zionist leaders, too, posed as bearers of a democratic, revolutionary ideology of national liberation. They juggled adroitly with radical slogans popular among the mass of the people, seeking to win over Jewish workers and gain the support of the public at large in countries where they operated. It was by these tactics, for example, that Louis Brandeis, leader of the American Zionists and Associate Justice of the US Supreme Court, went out of his way to distract Americans from the class struggle and urge American workers to cooperate with their employers. In September 1917, under his influence a group of Zionists went to Milwaukee to help Samuel Gompers, the right-reformist leader of the American Federation of Labour, rally the US labour movement for the imperialist war.

ZIONISM AND THE LABOUR SOCIALIST INTERNATIONAL

During World War I, leaders of the World Jewish Socialist Labour League (Poale Zion) campaigned in a pro-Zionist spirit to win various social-democratic leaders to their side. After the British government issued its Balfour Declaration (November 2, 1917), many social-democratic leaders followed the Zionist lead and portrayed that imperialist document as an "international guarantee for the salvation of Jews". A socialist conference in February 1918 defined the attitude of Entente social-democratic parties towards the allied peace aims. Among other things, they approved the resolution on setting up a Jewish national home in Palestine, thus duplicating earlier resolutions of Britain's Labour Party and the Trades Union Congress. A Palestine Poale Zion delegation was invited to a social-democratic conference in Berne in February 1919. A conference of the Second International in Amsterdam on April 26-29, 1919 approved the predatory Versailles Treaty, and adopted a resolution calling on the League of Nations to help determine the conditions for building a Jewish national home

in Palestine and for the representation of the Jewish people in the League of Nations.¹

By the end of World War I, as we see, and especially after the Great October Socialist Revolution, most leaders of the then practically defunct Second International had had a change of heart and recognised social-Zionism as a socialist current. In general, they favoured helping Zionism as a whole. This change of heart was the effect and vivid indication of the further drift rightward of most social-democratic leaders.

In February 1920, Poale Zion figured as a member of the restored Second International, and thereupon as a member of the so-called 2¹/₂ International formed in February 1921 in Vienna by centrist social-democratic parties. Along with the other parties of that group, Poale Zion became a member of the Labour Socialist International formed at a congress in Hamburg in May 1923. The new body adopted right-wing reformist postures that had only recently been bitterly criticised by leaders of the 2¹/₂ International.

In June 1924, the executive of the Labour Socialist International announced that the Poale Zion Confederation was the only Palestinian party within the Labour Socialist International, that its members in other countries would also be registered as belonging to Palestine, and that henceforth it would have two votes at LSI congresses. The LSI leadership thus acted on one of the basic Zionist dogmas and officially declared the Jews an "extraterritorial nation" and Palestine as the Jews' "historical homeland". The social-Zionist party active not only in Palestine² but also in a few other capitalist countries, was adopted once and for all as a section of the LSI.

(It should be remembered that Poale Zion functioned within the LSI and generally in the international arena as simultaneously a Palestinian party and as a confedera-

¹ *Yearbook of the International Socialist Labour Movement 1956-1957*, Lincoln-Prager, London, 1956, p. 499.

² It was originally named Poale Zion, renamed Achduth Ha' Avoda (League of Labour) in 1919, and again renamed Mapai (Labour Party of Palestine) in 1930.

tion of parties that professed to represent the interests of Jewish workers elsewhere. The Achduth Ha' Avoda (later Mapai) delegation at LSI congresses never failed to include leaders of the Poale Zion Weltfarband (world league).

The leadership of the social-democratic movement invariably rendered social-Zionists, and the Zionist movement as a whole, enormous help. The LSI, for example, set up committees aiding the Zionist colonisation of Palestine in nearly all capitalist countries of Europe and America. More than 40 prominent socialist leaders attended a conference of the Weltfarband Poale Zion, which was specially called in Brussels in 1928 to obtain the support of social-democratic leaders. The conference passed a unanimous resolution saying that "the efforts of Jewish Labour (this was how social-Zionists called the Zionist colonisation of Palestine which, as we know, was backed by the local British administration—*Ed.*) to build a Jewish Commonwealth in Palestine deserved the active support of Socialists of all countries." A pro-Palestine Socialist Committee was formed to back the Zionist colonisation. It had a 20-man standing bureau under the chairmanship of Emile Vandervelde, head of the Belgian Workers' Party, who was at that time President of the LSI.

In September 1930, social-democratic leaders of many countries took part in the Congress for Labour Palestine convened by the Zionists in Berlin. Its purpose was to win the support of the social-democratic wing of the international labour movement. Some Social-Democrats also took part in congresses of the World Zionist Organisation and other Zionist associations.

The Achduth Ha' Avoda (later Mapai) and "attached" social-Zionists of various countries played a prominent part in the Labour Socialist International. Between its first and second congresses the Poale Zion Confederation was directly represented in its Executive with two votes at congresses instead of the previous one. At the second LSI congress at Marseilles (1925), the social-Zionists were represented on six out of its nine working bodies.

At the Fourth (and last) Congress of the LSI in Vienna in 1931, the social-Zionists commanded five votes. Repre-

sented on nearly all the congress committees, they used their position to propagate their ideas. Berl Locker maintained at that congress that the worldwide economic crisis had made it still more patently clear that the only salvation for Jewish working people was resettlement in Palestine. Extolling the Zionist-led labour movement in Palestine and spurning the national-liberation and labour movement of the Arabs there, Locker declared with typical Zionist arrogance that the Zionists had created a new working class despite the "stagnation" in the Near East, and added that it was "the sole, in any case the sole visible, outpost of international socialism in the Near East".¹

It was certainly no accident that, as a result, the leaders of the LSI recognised the Zionist pseudo-socialism aimed at keeping Jewish workers in bourgeois countries out of the general struggle against capital. It was no "concession" to Zionists nor exclusively an achievement of the Zionist lobby. It flowed from the ideology and strategy of the international social-democratic leadership in the period between the two world wars.

The LSI, we may recall, was most closely committed to the imperialist post-World War I Versailles system, which envisioned steady Zionist penetration into Palestine with Britain's support. Since the theory and practice of the Achduth Ha' Avoda (Mapai) were based on social-reformism and social-chauvinism (concealed behind pseudo-socialist rhetoric and such institutions as the kibbutz and the Histadruth), the LSI leaders, most of whom had conclusively turned their backs on Marxism, did not fail to support it. They were eager to pry away working Jews from the international communist movement, to sow doubt among them about the progressiveness of the Soviet governments' nationalities policy, and to weaken the communist parties.

Right-wing Social-Democrats and the Zionists were of like mind concerning the Jewish question. Already in the 1920s and 30s, right-wing Social-Democrats extolled the false Zionist idea that everywhere outside Palestine Jews were denied a sound economic and political basis. They

¹ *Fourth Congress of the Labour Socialist International*, LSI Secretariat, Zurich, 1932, pp. vi, 193.

also accused the Soviet government of "oppressing Jews", of "hostility to Jewish culture", and the like, portraying the Communists' opposition to Zionism, and also to Judaism (as to any other religion), as anti-Semitic and as evidence of "anti-democratism and dictatorship". The social-Zionists and the LSI declared the social-democratic movement a champion of Jews all over the world and a consistent fighter against anti-Semitism. Right-wing Social-Democrats supported the underground counter-revolutionary activities of social-Zionists in the Soviet Union.

The alliance of the social-democratic movement with the Zionist pseudo-socialists, and thus with Zionism as a whole, was the result of the hostile or contemptuously indifferent attitude of the social-democratic leadership towards the national liberation movement of the Arab peoples.

A certain section of social-democratic functionaries and rank-and-file Social-Democrats favoured Zionism because they believed the specious social-Zionist propaganda that Zionism was a national liberation movement and that the left Zionists were fighting for the interests of the Jewish working people and would build a socialist society in Palestine. Some Social-Democrats, who did not see to the bottom of these confusing (sometimes deliberately confusing) issues, sided with Zionism in protest to the anti-Semitism rampant after World War I in many bourgeois countries (in some of which it was state policy). Yet, blinded by anti-communism, the right-wing Social-Democrats (and, for that matter, the Zionists) did not come to grips actively enough with Hitler Nazism, the chief bearer and instigator of anti-Semitism.

There has never been, nor is there now, a correct understanding of the correlation and interrelationship between Zionism and anti-Semitism among Social-Democrats (including those who opposed Zionism). As a rule, social-democratic theorists regarded, and now regard, Zionism as a reaction to anti-Semitism. They do not see Zionism as the ideology and policy of the extreme nationalist section of the Jewish bourgeoisie. As they see it, anti-Semitism alone furthered, and now furthers, the spread of Zionism. The Zionist leadership, as we see, has always used, and now

uses, anti-Semitism for its ends. It has a stake in fanning anti-Semitic sentiment. But that is no reason to think that anti-Semitism is the sole cause of Zionism. To think so is to side with one of the main Zionist ideas.

Some part in winning support for Zionism within the LSI was played by leaders of social-democratic parties of Jewish descent. These were solicited by the social-Zionists, and some of them, those who did not want a revolutionary settlement of the Jewish question, adopted Zionist or pro-Zionist postures. It should be noted, however, that there had always been many non-Jewish social-democratic leaders among the advocates of Zionism, and conversely, many Jewish Social-Democrats among the opponents of Zionism.

Acting chiefly through its pseudo-socialist wing¹, international Zionism always made the most of the aid and support of social-democratic leaders. The latter, too, had a stake in cooperating with the social-Zionists and most other Zionist currents.

Zionist pseudo-socialists in various countries sought close ties with the local social-democratic parties, the trade unions and youth, women's and other organisations under the social-democratic leadership and control. Many social-Zionist leaders were simultaneously members of other social-democratic parties, and some of them also held high offices in various Zionist organisations. In the United States, the local Poale Zion took part in forming the American Labour Party, and later in the 1920s the Liberal Party, and wished to be a component of those parties. Along with the Social-Democratic Party, the Zionist "Socialists" tried to create a broader social-reformist workers' party. In Britain, the Poale Zion has been a collective member of the Labour Party since 1916. This tactic is, indeed, widespread among the Zionist pseudo-socialists.

The social-Zionists do everything they can to gain influence and seize leadership in non-Zionist petty-bourgeois Jewish organisations, trade unions, etc. Both their left and right wings are active in this respect. The Poale

¹ In the early 1930s, the Zionist pseudo-socialists became the main Jewish political party in Palestine, and from 1933 on began playing the leading role in the World Zionist Organisation.

Zion—Achduth Ha' Avoda (Mapai), and its related parties and groups in various countries, have been active chiefly among right-wingers in the social-democratic parties and among Jewish right-wing reformists. The Left Poale Zion, the Hashomer Hatzair (Young Guard), and the Ber Borochov Clubs, worked among left Socialists not connected with the Labour Socialist International and among the radical segment of Jewish workers and intellectuals.

The Histadruth (the general Jewish workers' federation in Eretz Israel), headed by social-Zionists, was for many years (from 1923) the only "Asiatic" organisation in the social-reformist Amsterdam International Federation of Trade Unions, and had extensive contacts with reformist trade unions in bourgeois countries. Branches and offices of the Histadruth functioned in the United States, Britain, France, Poland, and a few other countries, where they like other Zionist and pro-Zionist organisations, collected funds for the colonisation of Palestine, solicited immigrants for the Promised Land, propagated the "Palestine idea", etc.

The results achieved by the social-Zionists in the LSI and how they used their influence in respect to other parties, may be illustrated by the actions taken on their insistence, above all by the British Labour Party, in 1929, 1930 and 1931.

Frightened by a new outbreak of struggle for national liberation among Palestinian Arabs, the Mapai, only just formed and not yet fully constituted, appealed to the LSI Executive in September 1929 to support the Zionist evaluation of the dramatic events unfolding in Palestine. The Weltfarband Poale Zion sent the British Labour Party a memorandum to that effect, submitted to the annual Labour Party Conference by the British Poale Zion group. The document opposed the view of a British government committee that the Arab rising in Palestine of 1929 was triggered by Jewish immigration and the consequent land shortage suffered by indigenous Arabs. The Poale Zion people in all countries, and the Jewish trade unions in the United States, mounted a clamorous protest movement against the British government's intentions to restrict Jewish

immigration to Palestine. In June 1930, the Mapai and Histadruth delegates at the London conference of British Empire labour parties pleaded for support.

The 1930 annual conference of the British Labour Party approved a resolution drafted by the British Poale Zion, which called for assistance to the immigration and compact settlement of Jews in Palestine. Following the publication of a White Paper by the British government, restricting Zionist land purchases and Jewish immigration to Palestine, the Weltfarband Poale Zion addressed itself to Foreign Secretary Arthur Henderson (who was simultaneously secretary and treasurer of the Labour Party), saying the Jewish working class was being humiliated by Britain's Labour government, and voicing the hope the Labourites would reverse their policy. The Labour Party leadership quickly formed a committee under Henderson to "eliminate misunderstanding". In February of the following year, Prime Minister Ramsay MacDonald informed Zionist leader Chaim Weizmann that the White Paper had, in effect, been annulled. For the sake of solidarity with the social-Zionists and Zionism in general, bending to Zionist pressure, the Labour leaders consented to what was tantamount to loss of British influence among Arabs in Palestine and the Arab East.

Zionism extracted the maximum benefit from various social-democratic actions justifying the "Palestine idea" and other Zionist pseudo-socialist dogmas. As a rule, the social-democratic press and LSI leaders described the activity of social-Zionists in Palestine and elsewhere as socialistic and progressive. Even the chauvinist policy of the Zionist pseudo-socialists towards Arab farmers and workers was, of all things, portrayed as selfless internationalist aid. Not a word of criticism came from the Labour Socialist International.

Only a few voices critical of Zionism resounded in the LSI policy. To be sure, the criticism was largely superficial and abstract. It only noted the unscientific nature and lack of promise of the Zionist plans, and did not see that Zionism (including its left wing) was being shaped into an ally and tool of imperialism.

The social-democratic critics of Zionism were characteristically inconsistent, and did not see the true substance of Zionism which was carefully camouflaged by refined demagoguery, shrewd tactical manoeuvres, and exploitation of anti-Semitism, which existed, and now exists, in practically every bourgeois country.

Even Karl Kautsky, the most serious social-democratic critic of Zionism, was incapable—owing to his own social reformism and anti-Sovietism—of producing a thorough class analysis of Zionism and showing its pro-imperialist and anti-people character. His criticism of Zionism, too, was inconsistent, and to some extent contradictory.

As the majority of LSI leaders drifted to increasingly reactionary positions, and the convergence between various Zionist factions on a pro-imperialist basis became increasingly intensive, social-democratic leaders became less and less critical of even the blatantly bourgeois currents of Zionism. Neither the social-Zionists nor the social-democratic leaders made any move to expose the true substance of the fascist and pro-fascist Zionist faction (the so-called Revisionist Party), and have never come to grips with it.

In sum, the social-democratic alliance with Zionism, chiefly through the Weltfarband Poale Zion, had at all times been of a reactionary nature. In contrast to what the two sides of the alliance kept saying, it held no promise of “liberation” for the labouring sections of Jews in various countries, including Palestine, and, on the contrary, did untold harm to labouring Jews and the true cause of socialism and democracy by fanning chauvinist and social-reformist sentiment and weakening the progressives.

In Palestine, it spurned the policy of cooperation, mutual assistance and fraternity between Jewish and Arab working people in the common struggle against the British colonialists and their agents, the Zionists and the Arab feudal lords. Instead, the so-called labour leaders of the Jewish community, who acted as collaborators of the British colonialists and functioned as colonialists themselves, followed a policy that turned the bulk of the Jewish population in Palestine into a tool of Zionism.

ZIONISM AND THE SOCIALIST INTERNATIONAL

Following World War II, and especially after the constitution of Israel (May 1948), acting above all through the Mapai, which was the main party of the government coalition in Israel in 1948-77, and also through its branches in other capitalist countries, Zionism sought to make the greatest possible use of the support it enjoyed among a considerable section of the social-democratic movement. Up to and including the 1970s the bulk of Socialist International leaders, and leaders of many of its affiliated parties, supported almost every move of Israel's ruling quarters, and also helped the leadership of international Zionism. Most leaders of the Socialist International, for example, did not rebuke Israel for participating in the tripartite aggression (along with Britain and France) against Egypt in 1956. And the Israeli attack on neighbouring Arab states in 1967 was declared a "defensive war".

Many social-democratic leaders stuck to, and still repeat, the Zionist propaganda tale that the Arabs want to wipe out Israel, and the like. Not a word is said in the social-democratic press of Arabs in Israel suffering from brutal discrimination. No social-democratic paper ventures to criticise Zionist chauvinism and racism. None ever mentions the militarism and clericalism that are riding high in Israel, or the emasculation of bourgeois democracy.

More, some Socialist International leaders have until recently been advertising Israel as "a most democratic", "semi-socialist", even "socialist" country.

For many years, Israel's social-democratic admirers extolled the kibbutzim, moshavim and the Histadruth as "pillars of socialism", "socialist islets", or at least "institutions that assure progress towards socialism".

Thanks to the support of certain socialist leaders, the Mapai is still playing an important part in the international social-democratic movement, especially the Socialist International. The Mapai (now Mai) was a member of the Committee of International Socialist Conferences

(COMISCO) in 1947-51, and is listed as one of the founders of the present-day Socialist International.

Ever since the Second Congress of the Socialist International (1952) the Mapai-Mai has invariably been represented on the SI Bureau, its governing body. There are also Israeli representatives on the governing bodies of the Socialist International of Women and the International Union of Socialist Youth. The Histadruth, which is headed by Zionist quasi-socialists, is highly active in the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions and the worldwide social-reformist trade-union movement generally. In July 1973, it also joined the Asia Regional Organisation of the ICF TU.

Backed by influential social-democratic quarters and making wide use of pseudo-socialist rhetoric and tactical manoeuvres, the Zionists advertise their movement as a Jewish national liberation movement, a Jewish revolution, with Israel as a "buttress of democracy" in the Middle East.

The Israeli leaders' ties with top personalities in the Socialist International are conceived as camouflage for the chauvinist, racist, pro-imperialist policy of Israel and of Zionist leaders abroad who have integrated Zionism in the imperialist system and are coordinating their policy and propaganda with imperialism's global interests and strategic designs.

In the advanced capitalist countries, acting in the interests of Zionism as a whole, social-Zionists are doing their utmost to strengthen the hand of Israel and Zionism, and are securing for them the maximum aid and support of the Socialist International, its affiliated parties, and the related social-reformist trade unions, and women's, youth, student, and other organisations. They are also working to win over, or at least neutralise, the so-called New Left. Zionist pseudo-socialists invariably participate in, and often instigate, anti-communist and anti-Soviet campaigns mounted under the auspices of the imperialist powers and the right-wing social-democratic movement.

For a number of years, backed by leaders of the Socialist International, on the one hand, and by imperialist monop-

olies, notably those of the United States, on the other, the Israeli leaders portrayed Israel as a "sociological laboratory" and a model for the economically underdeveloped countries of the Third World, a "faithful friend" of the peoples of Africa, Asia, and Latin America.

In fact, however, the aim was to:

- weaken, divide, mislead, and neutralise the national liberation movement in Africa, Asia, and Latin America, and to pry away, or at least isolate, the developing countries from the socialist community and socialist-oriented states;

- distort, discredit, and weaken the Arab national liberation movement, and first of all the struggle of the Arab people of Palestine for their lawful national rights;

- oppose the Arab liberation movement to the general struggle of the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America for complete national independence, and for democracy and social progress;

- strengthen the hand of the reactionary conservative forces in the Arab East, prevent the Arab countries from taking the anti-imperialist non-capitalist road, incite strife among Arab states and among various Arab political parties, drive a wedge between them and the Palestinian resistance movement, weaken the PLO by playing on the contradictions within its leadership, fanning and instigating contradictions and factional struggles, fortify the economic and political positions of Israel and Zionism as a whole within certain developing countries, split the working-class, trade-union, youth and women's movements in those countries, setting them on the reformist and revisionist course, and stimulate and fan anti-Soviet and anti-communist sentiments and prejudices.

Apart from the above aims, Zionism is out to strengthen its local parties and organisations in Latin America and obtain a continuous flow of money from the Jewish communities there, and to promote Jewish emigration, above all that of the youth, to Israel.

To secure its aims, the Mapai-Mai leadership has built a ramified, flexible apparatus in most countries of the world. This includes regional Mapai-Mai bureaus, missions

of the Histadruth, labour attachés of Israeli embassies and missions, social-Zionist parties and organisations active in various countries, and Zionists and pro-Zionists working within various governmental and non-governmental international organisations. It stands to reason that similar activity is carried on by all other Zionist parties, all bodies of the World Zionist Organisation, the Jewish Agency, the World Jewish Congress, and other international and regional Zionist organisations.

For a number of years, the Israeli government, backed by most leaders of the Socialist International, had devoted much attention to the Third World. The Mapai was highly conspicuous in the Asian Socialist Conference (ASC) formed in January 1953. G. H. Jansen, an Indian journalist and diplomat, noted that in a matter of a few years the Israelis succeeded in dominating the Asian socialist movement because of what he described as their greater financial resources. "The political dividends accruing to Israel," he wrote, "in the shape of political contacts with several Asian countries, amply justified this investment".¹

In substance, the Mapai was a trusted representative of the Socialist International in the Asian Socialist Conference, where, with the backing of the right-wing Socialists of Japan and Malaya, it tried—abortively, it is true—to secure consent for the ASC's affiliation with the Socialist International and the renunciation by Asian countries of neutralism and non-alignment.

Since, for various reasons, the ASC had in fact ceased to exist by the mid-1960s, the Socialist International set up a Bureau of Asia-Pacific Socialist parties (later renamed the Asia-Pacific Socialist Organisation) with headquarters in Singapore, which, along with a few Asian socialist parties, included the Mai. But this body, too, proved incapable of vigorous activity.

An instrument of the imperialist powers' neo-colonialist policy in the developing countries, Israel also acted, and is

¹ G. H. Jansen, *Zionism, Israel and Asian Nationalism*, Institute for Palestine Studies, Beirut, 1971, p. 224.

still trying to act, as the trusted representative of the Socialist International's leadership. Its "democratic", "anti-colonial" and "socialist" image was intended to conceal Israel's true role as the Trojan Horse in Africa, Asia, and Latin America. The social-Zionist leaders of Israel systematically visited the countries in question, and organised all sorts of meetings, seminars, courses, and the like, for their trade-union, party, youth and women's activists, and members of the cooperative movement.

The right-wing Social-Democrats pinned great hopes on the Afro-Asian Institute for Labour Studies and Cooperation¹ founded in 1960 by the Histadruth in Tel Aviv with the financial aid of the AFL-CIO, and also on the Carmel International Training Centre for women from developing countries in Haifa, and on the Centre for Cooperation Studies and Labour for Latin America. By 1971, as many as 2,500 people from 85 countries completed courses at the Afro-Asian Institute. The Israeli leaders hoped that these people would help carry out Israel's plans in the developing countries, and propagate the "democratic socialism" practiced in Israel and "the Israeli way of life". And it must be admitted that a number of prominent national and trade-union leaders in the Afro-Asian countries had in those days fallen for the refined demagoguery and tactics of the social-Zionist leaders of Israel.

In May 1967, the Mapai's central educational establishment Beit Berl (Berl House, named in honour of Berl Katznelson, a prominent social-Zionist leader) opened a so-called Centre for Socialist Thought with the object of studying "the various trends within the international socialist movement today and the application of their programmes and methods of action in developing countries". Its organisers defined as one of its main purposes "to engage in dialogues concerning problems of socialist ideology and practice with parties both in Asia and in Africa which neither belong to the Socialist International nor identify themselves as social-

¹ In 1972 it was renamed the International Institute for Development, Cooperation, and Labour Research.

ist parties while endeavouring to implement in practice the fundamental principles of socialism.”¹

Significantly, a special session of the Socialist International Council at which representatives of the Asian Social Conference were present, gathered in Haifa (in April 1960) to discuss SI activity in the developing countries. One of the main contributions at that session (devoted to “African problems”) was made by Golda Meir, leader of the Mapai-Mai who was then Foreign Minister, and who later became Prime Minister of Israel. The Haifa session (the first and until February 1973 the only session of the Socialist International Council outside Europe) drew up a reformist neocolonialist strategy and action programme for right-wing Social-Democrats in the Afro-Asian countries, thus again revealing the role of Mapai as a strike force of so-called democratic socialism in the developing countries. This role was assigned to Mapai on the grounds that Israel was, ostensibly, a young developing country that had fought gloriously for independence and was successfully building a “democratic socialist society”.

Concealing their true essence, the social-Zionists managed to secure fairly extensive ties with some of the social-democratic and related parties in Asia, Africa and Latin America in the period from 1940 to the 1960s. Mapai’s relations with leaders of the Socialist Party of Burma (SPB), which had in fact been the ruling party from 1948 to 1962, were especially friendly. This was due to the closeness of their theoretical ideas and political courses, and also to the skilled demagoguery and tactics of the Mapai leaders, who paraded as friends of Burma. As a result, Burma was the only participant in the Bandung Conference of Afro-Asian Countries (1955) that opposed the resolution backing the rights of the Arab people of Palestine.

Mapai also collaborated with right-wing Socialists in India, Nepal, Japan, and Indonesia. The Israeli social-Zionists helped in founding the reactionary, pro-colonialist

¹ *Socialist International Information*, Vol. XVI, No. 18, 1966, p. 199.

Social-Democratic Party of Madagascar,¹ and worked to win the trust of various parties close to the social-democratic movement in Africa. They also wooed related social-democratic parties in the Arab countries. But their attempts failed to yield results.

In Latin America, the Israeli pseudo-socialists are using certain channels of the Socialist International to strengthen their hand among social-democratic and related parties. They exploit their ties there to buttress the general positions of Israel and Zionism. The Mapai-Mai has relations with about a dozen parties that are in one way or another associated with the Socialist International. Its closest ties are with the National Liberation Party of Costa Rica. In the summer of 1972, Mai and the West German social-democratic Friedrich Ebert Foundation organised a special seminar at Beit Berl for Latin American political parties affiliated or close to the Socialist International. Participants in the seminar, as Allan Day, editor-in-chief of *Socialist Affairs*, organ of the Socialist International, reported, "met there to discuss development problems".² The Centre for Cooperation Studies and Labour for Latin America, founded in 1962 in Israel, has trained several thousand people who, as conceived by the Zionists and social-democratic leaders, will propagate Zionism and "democratic socialism" in their countries.

Mapai-Mai activities in the framework of the Socialist International (along with the World Labour Zionist Movement) were not confined to the developing countries. Mai has been taking, and now takes, a most active part in almost all the undertakings and actions of the Socialist International.

Until the mid-1970s, nearly every issue of the *Socialist International Information* (renamed *Socialist Affairs* in 1972) contained articles by Israeli and other personalities propagating, justifying, or extolling the policy of the Israeli government and the Mapai-Mai leadership. Social-Zionist

¹ The party was dissolved by Madagascar's progressive government in 1975.

² *The New Middle East*, No. 52-53, 1973, p. 52.

leaders still contribute articles to that publication on various "theoretical" and political topics. One of their favourite subjects is what they call the Jewish question in the Soviet Union and other socialist countries. Their writings are shot through with malicious slander aimed at fanning anti-communism and anti-Sovietism.

Few conferences, committees, working groups or delegations of the Socialist International have no social-Zionist representative.

At the 12th Congress of the Socialist International in Vienna (in 1972), Golda Meir was elected one of the eight vice-presidents of the Socialist International. Since then, a Mai leader is invariably elected to that office.

THE WORLD LABOUR ZIONIST MOVEMENT AND THE SOCIALIST INTERNATIONAL

The World Labour Zionist Movement, too, has been a full member of the Socialist International until 1976.¹ At the 13th Congress of the Socialist International it was made an associated member along with the Bund.

The WLZM holds international and regional conferences and carries out other activities, to promote Zionism and back up Israel's ruling circles, notably the social-Zionist elite. Its bureau and secretariat have a large number of Mai people. They number as many as 50 per cent of the bureau personnel, for example, and, indeed, Mai is officially regarded by the Socialist International and its affiliated parties as the nucleus of the WLZM.

At present, the World Labour Zionist Movement has affiliated parties and associations in the United States, Britain, Canada, South Africa, France, Argentina, Brazil, Australia, Belgium, the Netherlands, Austria, Uruguay, Mexico, Venezuela, Colombia, Peru, Italy, Denmark, Switzerland, Sweden, and Chile, as well as Israel.

¹ The WLZM has existed since August 1932 in its present shape, but it considers 1907, when the Weltfarband Poale Zion was established in The Hague, as the year it was founded.

The largest and most influential WLZM branch is in the United States, where five of its organisations function within the framework of the Labor Zionist Alliance: Poale Zion, League for Labor Israel, Pioneer Women, Ihud Habonim (League of Builders, a youth organisation), and Farband Labor Zionist Fraternal Order, whose total membership is officially said to exceed 100,000. The National Committee for Labor Israel (founded in 1923) and the American Histadruth Trade Union Council (founded in 1945) are highly active in promoting the interests of the Israeli rulers and international Zionism. These organisations collect funds for the Histadruth in the United States and Canada, render it all sorts of support, and propagate social-Zionism among Jews and non-Jews in America. In 1969 alone, for example, the National Committee for Labor Israel, jointly with the Pioneer Women, collected 3.4 million dollars for the Israeli trade unions. All kinds of assistance to the Israeli Histadruth is rendered by the Women Council for Histadruth in Israel, the Histadruth Foundation for Educational Travel, the American Histadruth Cultural Exchange Institute, and a few other pro-Zionist organisations.

The Zionist labour organisations in the United States are closely connected with the so-called Jewish trade unions and certain other social-democratic organisations that do not formally call themselves Zionist. Foremost among these is the Jewish Labor Committee formed in 1933, which has half a million members. The activity of this anti-communist and anti-Soviet organisation crosses the borders of the United States, encompassing Canada and some European countries. This committee, where the reactionary International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union and New York's United Federation of Teachers play a prominent role, is a vehicle of right-wing social-reformism, Jewish petty-bourgeois nationalism, and, in fact, social-Zionism.

The same may be said of the Jewish Socialist Farband of America, branches of the Workmen's Circle, and the Iddishist Penclub, all of which are connected with the Bund. The right-wing social-democratic *Jewish Daily Forward* appearing in New York has been telling its readers

gleefully that all the “distinctly socialist tendencies have surfaced in Zionism”.

Already in the early 20th century, backed by leaders of the AFL and the Social Democratic Party of the USA,¹ and later also by the Congress of Industrial Organisations, the Labor Zionists managed to win over a large section of the social-reformist trade-union and social-democratic movement. In September 1969, speaking at a Histadruth congress, Vice-President of the AFL-CIO and President of the International Brotherhood of Longshoremens (US), Thomas Gleason, stressed that there had been “close ties between the AFL-CIO and the Histadruth over fifty years of common struggle”, stating slanderously in his eulogy of Israeli policy that leaders of progressive Arab countries are out “to crush Israel”.²

The Meany-Lovestone-Dubinsky-Kirkland group in the AFL-CIO leadership acted invariably as an ally of the Israeli rulers and of international Zionism. At the AFL-CIO convention in 1973, it pushed through a resolution urging all-round American support of Israel in the war and in the efforts to secure a Middle East peace settlement on terms set by the USA and Israel. At that time, in a cable to US Secretary of State Henry Kissinger, George Meany described Egypt and Syria as aggressors and repeated the old lie about the Arabs wanting the destruction of Israel and “democracy in the Middle East”.³

The pro-Israel and pro-Zionist activity of the American trade-union bureaucracy and right-wing Social-Democrats was highly diverse. They backed all imperialist and Zionist actions in the Middle East, saddling the Arab peoples with defeatist peace settlements with the aim of establishing US-Israeli domination in the region.

¹ Since 1973 it is called Social-Democrats USA. There are many Zionists and pro-Zionists in it and the related Young Socialists League. The Democratic Socialists USA, a more progressive party than Social-Democrats USA, also has many Zionists and pro-Zionists in its ranks.

² See *World Trade Union Movement*, No. 6/7, 1970, London, pp. 34, 35.

³ *AFL-CIO News*, October 13, 1973, p. 1.

One of the main places in the lineup of foes of detente in America (opposing mutual understanding between the Soviet Union and the United States) belongs to the leaders of the AFL-CIO, the US Zionists, and the right-wing Social-Democrats.

The pseudo-socialist Zionist wing in Britain, consisting of the local Poale Zion and its women's and youth organisations, has the unfailing support of many Labour Party leaders, who adhere to Zionist and pro-Zionist positions, such as Richard Crossman, a Labour leader who has often been minister. In the 1960s, the British Poale Zion formed a Labour Friends of Israel organisation, which numbers most Labour MPs among its members. Israel and Zionism enjoyed the greatest Labour Party support when Labour leader Harold Wilson was Prime Minister (1964-1970 and 1974-1976), and also headed the Labour Friends of Israel organisation. In 1973, then leader of the opposition, Wilson went out of his way to have Britain join the United States in rendering extensive military aid to Israel, the aggressor. At a conference of leaders of the Western powers, and at a meeting of Socialist International leaders in 1974, Harold Wilson's posture was also distinctly pro-Zionist. In *The Chariot of Israel*, a book that appeared in 1981, that former Labour leader again acted as an exalted champion of Israel and Zionism. At present, Labour MP Granville Janner is president of the Board of Deputies of British Jews, which follows a pro-Zionist policy. It is one of the two leading organisations of the Jewish community in Britain. Janner's wife is vice-president of the Federation of Women Zionists of Great Britain and Ireland, and of the Association of British Jewish Youth.

It should be noted, however, that no few Labour leaders took a negative view of Zionism. Ernest Bevin, who was Foreign Secretary in 1945-51, made clear, for example, that it was in the interests of the British Empire to bet on the Arab countries rather than on the Zionists. Clement Attlee, Lord Passfield (Sidney Webb) and other prominent Labour personalities, too, were anything but unconditional allies and patrons of Zionism.

As noted in the *Socialist International Information* in the mid-60s, the Labour Zionists of France were the strongest force in the local Zionist movement with friendly ties with the SFIO (now the French Socialist Party). It will be recalled that during the tripartite Anglo-French-Israeli aggression against Egypt in 1956, Guy Mollet, leader of the SFIO, was Prime Minister of France. On June 1, 1967, when Israel launched another aggression against Egypt, Guy Mollet sent a telegram of solidarity to Golda Meir, then Secretary General of Mapai.

Today, too, certain leaders of the French Socialist Party maintain a distinctly, or predominantly, pro-Israel and pro-Zionist posture, and, in fact, promote the policies of Israel and Zionism. In April 1980, for example, when it was more than clear to the world public that Camp David had failed to bring about peace and had only aggravated the Middle East situation, the *Riposte*, bulletin of the French Socialist Party, noted proudly that the FSP was the only large French political party that viewed the Camp David agreements as a positive gesture. The bulletin announced further that a few socialist leaders had formed a Judaism and Socialism Association to collate their respective ideals, because the two could be merged for the sake of peace. As we know, the same thing is being demagogically declared at present by the social-Zionists and adepts of Biblical socialism.

In Austria, too, Zionist quasi-socialists have fairly strong positions. In the recent past, they were the largest group in the Jewish community in Vienna. Pro-Zionist sentiment ran very high among part of the leaders of the Socialist Party of Austria, which plays a prominent part in the Socialist International.

In Canada, many social-Zionists are active in the New Democratic Party (the country's social-democratic party), and the same prevails in a number of other countries. Champions of nearly everything that Israel's rulers and the international Zionist leadership happen to do are still active in a number of other social-democratic parties, such as the Labour Party of the Netherlands, the Social-Democratic party of Germany, and the Belgian Socialist Party.

The biggest Latin American branch of the World Labour Zionist Movement is in Argentina, where there are four Zionist quasi-socialist organisations with connections in the Argentinian socialist movement, which is divided into several groups. The social-Zionists in Australia have close contacts with leaders of the local Labour Party.

The parties and organisations in the WLZM act in the interests of the Israeli rulers and Zionism as a whole, and, consequently, also in the interests of imperialism, of which international Zionism is an instrument irrespective of the political affiliation of its various currents and factions.

The Movement seeks to prevail on Jewish young people in various capitalist states to emigrate to Israel, or at least to convert them into more or less active supporters of Zionism. In recent years it has been especially active among Jewish students and the New Left, where many people are of Jewish origin.

To revitalise Zionist activity under the false pretenses of being socialist, the Movement had in the mid-60s founded an Institute for Education. The information department of the Movement also stepped up publication of various quasi-socialist periodicals and pamphlets in English, Spanish, French and Yiddish.

And still, the activity of social-Zionists is not yielding the results sought by the international Zionist movement. "All those who wish to be thought progressive, democratic and Left-wing," writes Itzhak Korn, ex-Secretary-General of the World Labour Zionist Movement, "are ashamed of being seen to side with us". This was why Korn urged changing "the image of Israel in the world". That, he held, was the prime task of the Labour Zionists.¹

The Zionist pseudo-socialists go out of their way to enlist labouring Jews who are not as yet for various reasons members of parties or organisations forming the World Labour Zionist Movement. Appropriate propaganda is also systematically conducted among non-Jews.

The Mapam, an Israeli left-wing social-Zionist party that had not been affiliated with the Socialist International

¹ *Jewish Frontier*, May 1970.

until 1980, and its branches in sixteen countries, propagate Zionism among people left of the Socialist International and among the intelligentsia. This is done inside and outside the Jewish communities. An emissary of Mapam, Dov Barnir, member of the party's central committee, for example, visited Montevideo in August 1970. The purpose of his visit, the Uruguay journal, *Marcha*, wrote, was to contact independent left currents and work out a common stand with "Marxist" Zionists enjoying some popularity in certain quarters (in Uruguay and Latin America in general). The *Marcha* printed a fairly large article by Barnir, expounding the left social-Zionist view of certain international affairs, above all those related to the Israeli-Arab conflict. In November 1972, this was followed up by a report on Mapam plans of settling the Mid-East crisis, delivered in Uruguay by another prominent Mapam personality, Mordehai Oren. A short time before, early in 1972, N. Davidowicz, leader of the Argentine Mapam, visited Juan Peron, then living in Madrid, and sought to prevail on him to issue a statement approving direct peace negotiations between Arabs and Israelis. Peron, however, refused to back up the Israeli rulers' idea of direct talks.

In Denmark, Mapam has lively contacts with the Socialist People's Party and in France its people often contribute to the left-wing bourgeois journal, *Nouvel Observateur*, which is also connected with the Rothschilds. The left Zionist organisation, Circle de Bernard Lazare, formed in France in 1954, is ideologically close to Mapam and collaborates closely with the United Socialist Party.

In its report to the 28th Congress of the World Zionist Organisation (1972), the Mapam leadership boasted that as a Zionist ideological section belonging to the left wing, Mapam "managed to make contact with non-affiliated Jews, and also with those who despaired of communism, have left the New Left and the old, or had been expelled from other liberation movements and thus came to us—to Zionism".¹

¹ *Survey of the Activities of Zionist Parties and WIZO* published by the Organisation and Information Department of the Zionist Executive, Jerusalem, 1972, p. 33.

ISOLATED ISRAEL. NEW MID-EAST POSTURE OF THE SOCIALIST INTERNATIONAL

The aggressive expansionist colonialist and neocolonialist policy of the Israeli rulers and Zionist leaders has resulted in Israel's increasing isolation on the international scene. As a token of solidarity with the Arabs, nearly all the African states had broken off or suspended diplomatic relations with Israel by mid-November 1973.

Most Asian countries are increasingly critical of Israel, which its rulers have turned into an imperialist gendarme in the Middle East. Guyana, whose ruling party, the People's National Congress, is, according to leaders of the Socialist International, of a social-democratic makeup, broke off relations with Tel Aviv in March 1974. Other countries in South America, too, are becoming increasingly aware that present-day Israel follows a pro-imperialist policy, that it spurns UN resolutions, and that it opposes detente and any improvement of the international climate. As a result, the hopes that a certain segment of the Socialist International's leadership pinned on the Mapai (Mai) as a vehicle of social-democratic influence in the developing countries, collapsed.

Of late, a change has come about in the views of leaders of certain socialist parties concerning the Israeli-Arab conflict, due chiefly to changes in the world and, particularly, in the Middle East, and to certain processes within the social-democratic movement itself. This is reflected, among other things, in the voting on Middle East resolutions in the UN Security Council, the General Assembly, and other UN bodies, in documents of the EEG countries, and articles in the social-democratic press.

A partial reassessment of the substance and reasons behind the Middle East conflict occurred at a London conference of Socialist International leaders in November 1973. Despite the efforts of Golda Meir, then Prime Minister of Israel, and her followers, the conference failed to draw up a joint document that the Israeli government and the Mai leaders could have used in their interests.

Ever since the mid-70s, the Socialist International displayed a tendency to oppose Israel's aggressive and expansionist policy. Despite furious resistance by the Mai, the World Labour Zionist Movement, Mapam and the pro-Zionist elements in some of the socialist parties, this tendency made gradual headway at the 13th (November 1976), 14th (November 1978), 15th (November 1980), 16th (April 1983), and 17th (June 1986) congresses of the Socialist International, at the SI Middle East conference in February 1978, the SI Bureau and other SI bodies, periodical meetings of SI leaders, and in the social-democratic press.

Delegations of leaders of social-democratic parties headed by the then chairman of the Socialist Party of Austria, Bruno Kreisky, visited the Middle East and Northern Africa in March 1974, February 1975 and March 1976. This and a few new features in the Socialist International's Mid-East policy showed that for political and geographic reasons, in view of its enormous natural wealth (above all oil), and the commercial potentialities of the Arab countries, the Socialist International's leadership had begun wooing them, thus ending its previous one-sided, in substance unconditional, support of Israel. Kreisky's missions were an effort of the social-democratic movement to buttress its positions in the Arab countries and establish ties with their national-democratic, populist, and certain other parties and organisations in a bid to have them join the Socialist International in one or another capacity.

Since the mid-70s, voices critical of Israel's policy have resounded, and quite loudly, in some social-democratic quarters. In an interview to *Al-Sayyad*, a Lebanese weekly, of September 15, 1979, Bruno Kreisky, for example, called on Western Europe and the USA to recognise the Palestine Liberation Organisation and back the UN Mid-East resolutions. He also called on Israel to stop its criminal war of extermination in Southern Lebanon "if it wants to live in peace and seeks true security". The Austrian socialist leader said peace in the Middle East would not be properly established until "Israeli troops are immediately and completely withdrawn from all occupied Arab territories". He

also said the rights of the Palestinians should be respected "to repatriate and set up an independent state under PLO leadership, for the PLO is the sole lawful representative of that people" on the basis of the resolutions and recommendations of the UN. In Kreisky's opinion the United States would one day, against its will, have to recognise the PLO under pressure of the events.

The late Olof Palme, who had been chairman of the Swedish Social-Democratic Labour Party and Prime Minister of Sweden (and also a vice-president of the Socialist International), stressed in an interview printed in *Bohemia*, a Cuban journal, on June 17, 1983, that Israel was an expansionist power that intended to complete the annexation of the West Bank. To do so, he said, the Israelis would either have to displace a million Palestinians or create a situation like that in South Africa. "Either of these two solutions," he said, "would blast the chances of peace to high heaven."¹

The Swedish government, headed by Social-Democrats, favours a peaceful settlement of the Middle East problem, and backs the proposal for negotiations by all concerned sides, the PLO included. It has been critical of Israel's aggressive course vis-à-vis the Arab states, has called repeatedly for fulfilment of the UN Middle East resolutions No. 242 and 338, and has also assisted Palestinian refugees and Lebanese affected by Israel's attack on Lebanon.

Israel's brutal aggression against Lebanon in June 1982 and the genocide loosened against the Palestinians elicited a new wave of sharp criticism in the Socialist International and, indeed, all over the world. Bruno Kreisky said in a *Stern* interview that he refused to have anything to do with Israel. "Gigantic crimes have occurred [in Lebanon], and those who keep silent are out-and-out accomplices", he said, and added: "Israel stands morally exposed". Kreisky said he was convinced "the Middle East problem had only one solution: the Palestinians had to get a state of their own, which would maintain the closest possible cooperation with its neighbours, and therefore also with Israel."²

¹ *Bohemia*, June 17, 1983.

² *Stern*, August 27, 1982.

In an interview to *The Guardian* of September 4, 1982, Bruno Kreisky was still blunter. "The position of Palestinians in Israel", he said, "is apartheid. They have nearly no rights, economically they are displaced, politically they are displaced and they are dominated by the Israeli army. Now the Israelis are making war. They are not willing to sit down and negotiate with the Palestinians. This is fascism. I do not hesitate to use this expression. This is the real fascism".

In a special resolution at its 1982 annual conference, the British Labour Party, which had for many years given the Zionists every possible support, angrily denounced the mass extermination of Palestinians in Sabra and Chatilla, and indicated for the first time that it recognised the PLO as the sole lawful representative of the Palestinians without which there could be no settlement in the Middle East. The resolution called on Labour to back the plan for a democratic Palestinian state as part of a long-term solution of the Palestinian problem. The conference expressed support for the patriotic Lebanese forces, and demanded that Israel withdraw its troops from Lebanese territory. The resolution was passed despite resistance by the Labour leadership in whose midst, as in Labour's parliamentary faction, pro-Israeli sentiment is still rife.

Three weeks after Israel's invasion of Lebanon, Willy Brandt, President of the Socialist International and Chairman of the Social-Democratic Party of Germany, issued an official statement condemning the new Israeli aggression and demanding recognition of the Palestinians' rights as a condition for peace in the Middle East. Brandt also stressed that Israel should allow for the participation of the Palestinian political leaders in such a settlement.¹

The Socialist International formed an advisory group to study the Middle East issue. Headed by Mario Soares, leader of the Portuguese Socialist Party who was then Prime Minister of his country, the group made four trips to the region, visiting a number of Arab countries and Israel between June 1982 and June 1984. At a press con-

¹ *Socialist Affairs*, No. 5, 1982.

ference in Lisbon on March 20, 1983, Soares presented his group's main findings. A Mid-East settlement, he said, depended most of all on the withdrawal from Lebanon of all foreign troops and on the future status of the West Bank and the Gaza Strip. But his report was not entirely consistent. It said, for example, that some provisions of the so-called Reagan Plan of September 1, 1982 (which denied Palestinians the right to having a sovereign state) coincided with provisions in the document of the September 1982 meeting of Arab heads of state in Fez, Morocco (which provided for the constitution of an independent Palestinian state under PLO guidance). The report also said that no Mid-East dialogue was possible without the PLO.¹

Since the Mai had in effect supported the Begin government's war against Lebanon, the socialist parties of Finland, Denmark, and Spain, to say nothing of the Progressive Socialist Party of Lebanon, demanded that the Zionist sham socialists should be expelled from the Socialist International. But this did not get the due support of the SI leadership.

After the piratical Israeli air-raid on PLO headquarters in Tunis on October 1, 1985, Bruno Kreisky and some other Socialist International leaders again wanted Mai expelled. But in October 1985 in Vienna the SI Bureau turned down their proposal, though it did by a majority vote denounce Israel's barbaric action and its aggressive policy vis-à-vis the neighbouring states, notably Lebanon.

Once again, the Zionist propaganda machine accused Kreisky of anti-Semitism, eliciting a sharp rebuttal by Fred Sinowatz, Chancellor of Austria, who said his government and the Austrian Socialist Party condemned the bombing of the PLO headquarters in Tunis.² The stand of Bettino Craxi, leader of the Italian Socialist Party, and that of many other Italian statesmen and political leaders, was the same. They criticised Israel for its policy vis-à-vis the Arab people of Palestine and Lebanon.

¹ *Arbeiter Zeitung*, March 21, 1983.

² *Arbeiter Zeitung*, October 1, 1985.

The Spanish Socialist Workers' Party, too, backs the national rights of the Arab people of Palestine, has rapped Tel Aviv's aggressions, and maintains contacts with the PLO. Yet on January 17, 1986, the Spanish government headed by Felipe González, General Secretary of the SSWP, established diplomatic relations with Israel for the first time since it was founded in 1948.

At a press conference, F. Fernandez Ordóñez, the socialist Foreign Minister, stressed specifically, however, that diplomatic relations did not mean that Madrid approved of Israel's occupation of Arab territories and its refusal to honour the right of Palestinians to form their own state. On the contrary, he said, diplomatic relations would enable Spain to contribute to a just settlement in the Middle East.

Felipe González, for his part, sent messages to Yasser Arafat, chairman of the PLO executive, and Shadhli Klibi, General Secretary of the Arab League, assuring them that Spain would not cease to support the "just cause of the Arabs at international forums" and to promote the lawful aspirations of the Arab people of Palestine, including the right to self-determination.

The African Socialist International formed in Tunis in February 1981, declared struggle against Zionism one of its main purposes. African national-democratic parties, with which the Socialist International is seeking ties and cooperation, are coming out ever more sharply against Israel's policy and above all against its alliance with the racist regime of South Africa. The International League of Young Socialists, too, is ever more firmly critical of Tel Aviv.

Despite these new developments, the social-democratic parties and the Socialist International refuse to acknowledge the UN General Assembly resolution of 1975, which rightly describes Zionism as a "form of racism and racial discrimination". They support the afore-mentioned Reagan Plan, aimed at establishing a Pax Americana coupled with a Pax Israelica, just as in the recent past they had accepted the Camp David accords, which pursued the same aims.

The main Socialist International parties support the so-called Amman Agreement concluded by King Hussein

of Jordan and Yasser Arafat on February 11, 1985, which is contrary to the all-Arab platform adopted on September 10, 1982 in Fez, and is not aimed at securing lasting and just peace in the Middle East. As before, many social-democratic leaders identify Israel's state terrorism with the extremist acts of despair committed by various Palestinian groups.

Indeed, with probably the sole exception of Bruno Kreisky, leaders of the Socialist International still adhere to the Zionist dogmas of a "worldwide Jewish nation", of Israel being the state of the Jews of all the world, the "special character and messianic mission of the Jewry", the "perpetuity of anti-Semitism", and so on.

While some parties of the Socialist International, as I have said earlier, call for a sovereign Palestinian state alongside Israel, and recognise the PLO as the sole lawful representative of the Arab people of Palestine, the Socialist International itself is still refraining from any clear statement. The Middle East resolution of its 16th Congress in 1983 referred inconclusively to "the right of the Palestinian people to self-determination and to their homeland", and added that "it is not the task of the Socialist International to decide whether the PLO is a legitimate representative of the Palestinian people". Though Israel is committing permanent aggression and genocide vis-à-vis the Palestinians, the 16th Congress resolution confined itself to deploring the "lack of political will" on Tel Aviv's part to find a just solution in the Middle East.

The Socialist International expressed "its concern about the fact that the Israeli government is intensifying its settlement policy on the West Bank" and noted that the settlements were "contrary to international law and a major and growing obstacle to peace efforts"¹, though, for some reason, no mention was made of the Zionist settlements in the Gaza Strip and Syria's Golan Heights.

It may be appropriate to note here that bourgeois statesmen of a fairly large number of countries have of late been opposing the continuous building of Israeli settlements

¹ *Socialist Affairs*, No. 3, 1983.

in occupied Arab territories. This, indeed, includes some prominent leaders of Jewish communities in the United States and other Western countries.

Nearly all leaders of the international social-democratic movement still ignore the constructive Soviet proposals for making just and lasting peace in the interests of all the states and peoples of the region, and gloss over in silence the Reagan Administration's role of patron and abettor of the Israeli government's policy.

A close study of the Socialist International's Mid-East documents, like the Social-Democrats' policy in the region, shows that the SI is counting on the so-called moderate but in fact conservative Arab countries and the right wing of the PLO, this latter being prepared, with a few reservations and on certain terms, chiefly of a tactical nature, to consent to a settlement that would only seemingly bring peace to the Middle East—the kind of settlement the United States and Israel are aspiring to.

The political line of the Social-Democrats concerning the Middle East is an interlacement of two conflicting trends (with no few intermediate currents in between). Those in the Socialist International and in its main parties who want to relinquish the bankrupt old policy are opposed by forces that in fact want no serious change and are bent on confining matters to a few verbal declarations.

The further evolution of this situation depends on the correlation of forces in the world arena and the Middle East, on the international climate, and on the processes that are unwinding within the social-democratic movement itself in connection with changes in the world in general (the leftward swing of a large section of the social-democratic rank-and-file, the greater differentiation among the functionaries and even among top-ranking leaders of certain socialist parties, and so on). It may be recalled that the message of the CPSU Central Committee to the 17th Congress of the Socialist International again noted that the Soviet people appreciated the Socialist International's efforts as an influential political force on the international scene in the fight for peace and disarmament, and against a world war.

There is a whole set of factors prompting a reassessment of the Socialist International leaders' attitude to the Israeli-Arab conflict. Among these factors are the successes of the socialist countries, notably in foreign affairs; the steady growth of the national liberation movement, notably of the Arab peoples; the continuously growing isolation of Israel on the international scene, its political and strategic defeat in the 1973 October war and the war against Lebanon in 1982-1986, which worsened the socio-political, economic, and psychological crisis in the country, and so on.

On the other hand, there is a set of factors holding down the positive trends in the Socialist International's Middle East policy and making for inconsistency and vacillation. These factors include the long-standing aftermaths of anti-communism, anti-Sovietism, opportunism and chauvinism, coupled with incomprehension, and in some cases outright hostility, towards the national liberation struggle of the Arab peoples and towards the progressive Arab states, and, furthermore, the close ties with NATO, the ideological closeness with the so-called Zionist socialism and the continuous pressure of imperialism and international Zionism, which do not want just and lasting peace in the region.

It would be a mistake to ignore the new trends in the Middle East policy of the Socialist International and some social-democratic parties, and no less of a mistake to exaggerate the impact and depth of these new developments.

A. Andreyev

**THE ISRAEL-SOUTH AFRICA
ALLIANCE IS A THREAT
TO THE NATIONAL
LIBERATION MOVEMENT**

International imperialism is doing its utmost to hold down the world's objective social renewal. For this it has mobilised its entire economic, scientific, technical and ideological potential. For this it is intensifying the arms race, escalating the politico-military confrontation with the socialist countries, and resorting to force in the zone of the national liberation movement in a bid to prevent its growth.

Imperialism's counter-offensive against the national liberation movement has, indeed, grown to unprecedented proportions and employs a great variety of means and methods. Giving priority to force, international imperialism, notably US imperialism, does not shrink from direct armed interference in the affairs of sovereign states, using for this extreme reactionary, anti-communist and anti-Soviet regimes. Special mention here should be made of the piratical conduct of America's strategic partners, Israel and South Africa.

The United States and its allies hope that the dangerous alliance between international imperialism, Zionism and racism, which sustains Tel Aviv's continuous wars in the Middle East and Pretoria's in southern Africa, will help them maintain their influence in the newly-free countries, which, as before, are of enormous importance to them—as a social reserve, as a storehouse of valuable raw materials lacking which the economy of the capitalist world would, in effect, become unviable, as a market for manufactured goods and with respect to its military plans, and as a source of cheap labour.

The United States, Israel and South Africa have con-

cluded no formal politico-military alliance. But they maintain close commercial, economic, political, and especially, military cooperation. And all three hold the palm for the number of acts of aggression they committed after World War II.

The policy of the United States, Israel and South Africa is causing legitimate and grave anxiety in the newly-free countries. Washington has set its sights on backing unpopular and destabilising progressive regimes. US imperialism, which dreads any deepening of the national liberation process, has gone over to undisguised military confrontation, using both its own armed forces and those of its satellites. Nor does it bother to conceal its hostility towards everything progressive, everything that works for freedom. It never hesitates to spurn the lawful rights of young sovereign states.

Defying international law, the UN Charter and the UN resolutions, the United States provides the reactionary terrorist regimes of Tel Aviv and Pretoria with all sorts of aid, and encourages their close cooperation with each other. There are probably no two countries in the capitalist world more alike than South Africa and Israel as to their home and foreign policy. Their alliance has, indeed, become a permanent negative factor for the national liberation struggle of the peoples of Africa and the Middle East.

It is therefore important to dig down to the reasons for their closeness, to pinpoint the aims and areas of their collaboration, and to examine the involvement of US imperialism in those aggressor states.

One of the main reasons for the closeness between the Israeli Zionists and the South African racists is the ideological and political closeness of the Zionist idea and apartheid. Both doctrines are extreme forms of bourgeois nationalism. Both are based on chauvinism and racial intolerance. Suffice it to glance at how Tel Aviv and Pretoria carry out their ideological guidelines. The orientation is obviously against the common people, with not the least concern for humanity. The sole aim is to further the positions of state-monopoly and private capital, and to protect the interests of world imperialism in the newly-free countries.

Resolution No. 3379 of the 30th UN General Assembly described Zionism as a form of racism and racial discrimination. It placed Israel under the same head as the racist regime in Pretoria. The home policy of the two regimes is marked by brutal national oppression, scorn for elementary human rights, police rule and violence, mass persecution of freedom fighters, and blatant anti-communism.

In South Africa, for example, over a hundred legislative acts have been enacted, formalising racial discrimination in all political, economic and social areas. In Israel, Zionism's racist essence is manifested in the treatment of Israeli citizens of Arab origin. Arabs are humiliated in the economic, political, cultural and other spheres. The purpose of the discrimination is to make Arabs lose heart, and leave Israel.

This racist policy became still more discriminatory after the right-wing Zionist Likud bloc came to power in 1977, and continues to be so at present under the so-called national unity government. Making the most of covert official support, fascist-minded hoodlums led by terrorist Meir Kahane have revitalised their activity. Having moved to Israel, Kahane, one of the organisers of the Jewish Defense League in the USA, wants to drive all Arabs out of Israel and Israeli-occupied territories by force. His gangs regularly attack Arabs to intimidate them.

Yitzhak Shamir made it quite clear that the Israeli leadership wants the same thing. "Our ultimate aim," he said in March 1984, "is the same as it was 40 years ago—to fight to put the Land of Israel completely in our hands and to free all its parts of foreigners, that is, of Arabs."¹

At present, official Israeli policy is more and more undisguisedly racist. Zionism, after all, is but a variety of racism.

In South Africa, too, racism is state policy. False scientifically, inhuman and socially reactionary, apartheid stands for the separate development of national and racial groups under the "gracious guidance" of the white minority. Pretoria has driven the indigenous population to economically

¹ Quoted from *Asia and Africa Today*, No. 4, 1985, p. 19.

poor areas, establishing a fake statehood for Africans in the form of bantustans, which occupy a mere 13 per cent of the country's area. This was done to dampen the national liberation struggle, to prevent any ethnic consolidation of Africans, and to have reserve armies of cheap labour.

The African majority is compelled to earn its livelihood in "white South Africa", where the mining and manufacturing industries are concentrated, and where South Africa produces 80 per cent of its steel, more than 60 per cent of its electric power, 80 per cent of its coal, 70 per cent of its gold, etc. People from the "independent" bantustans come to the "white" part of South Africa in the capacity of foreigners. Any unauthorised stay outside the bantustans is a punishable criminal offence: special tribunals handle more than 200,000 cases of that kind each year.

"The conflicts repose above all on South Africa's anachronistic policy," wrote the West German *Spiegel* in February 1985. "In the age of decolonisation, 4.8 million whites still rule over 24 million Africans and 3.7 million coloureds and Asians . . . and while the living standard of whites is comparable to that of Switzerland, South Africa's blacks suffer from poverty and discrimination".¹

Forty per cent of the poor receive a mere 6.2 per cent of total income, while the big South African companies and their counterparts from overseas continue to profit from the cheap labour and the misery of the African population. The payment for labour is totally based on racial criteria. The average monthly earnings of whites, coloureds, Asians and Africans amounts respectively to about 950, 300, 400, and 250 rands. Employment is similarly unfair. The African is the last to get a job and the first to be fired. Among the indigenous population, unemployment ranges between 21 and 24 per cent. In 1984, the number of officially registered jobless was 3 million, that is, 25 per cent of the economically active population.

South Africa's educational system is designed to train African children for an economically and politically subordinate role in society. They attend only specially segregated

¹ *Der Spiegel*, February 25, 1985.

educational establishments. Funds spent on the education of a black child are but one-tenth of the amount spent on the schooling of a white child. Apartheid principles are also maintained in culture, information, and religion.

Such is apartheid with its extreme type of moral and physical oppression. The African is denied practically all human rights. A person's place in society depends not on his or her ability or qualities, but on racial origin. This is juridically entrenched.

The government of South Africa has promised democratic reforms (to set up a tricameral parliament for whites, coloureds and Asians, which, in effect, leaves out Africans, that is, the vast majority). But the facts do not back up any of the promises. The brutal repressions showered upon participants in anti-racist demonstrations show that President Pieter Botha's government will defend the criminal system of apartheid as ferociously as its predecessors. The reprisals of today are much the same as those in Sharpville in 1960 and Soweto in 1976 and 1977, when nearly a thousand people were shot down in cold blood.

The journal *African Communist* notes rightly that owing to similar ideologies of national exclusiveness, the mentality and behaviour of the South African racists and the Israeli Zionists in respect to the majority of the local population is equally inhuman and typical of those who rate other nations as a "lower race" or "subhuman".

The foreign policies of Israel and South Africa have many features in common. They may be described as policies of aggression, annexation, expansionism, and colonial subjection of other peoples.

A bastion of imperialism in the Middle East, Israel is continually stoking up tensions. Its aggressions against Arab countries pursue far-reaching plans, notably those of a "Greater Israel" from the Nile to the Euphrates, of retaining its grip on occupied Arab lands, and gaining predominance in the region. It also pursues the interests and designs of US imperialism: to impose politico-military diktat on the Arab peoples, to turn back the clock to the days of colonial domination, to retain control over the

region's natural wealth, and to obtain military bases at strategically important points.

To carry these plans into effect, Israel is receiving generous American financial and military aid. This in addition to the funds received from the numerous Zionist organisations in the United States.

Ronald Reagan has special liking for Israel. Even before he became President, he said the US position "would be weaker without the political and military assets Israel provides". And after the fall of the Shah of Iran, he pointed out, that Israel's value had increased "as perhaps the only remaining strategic asset in the region on which the United States can truly rely."¹

Later, having become President, Reagan assured Israel's Zionist leaders that they had never had a better friend in the White House before.

Relying on Washington's support, the Israeli Zionists engage in outright brigandage. In June 1982, an Israeli army of 100,000 lunged into Lebanon, backed to the hilt by the US "strategic unanimity": the United States supplied the Israeli army with the latest arms, and gave Tel Aviv diplomatic backing. In the UN, the US representative vetoed a Security Council resolution condemning Israel and calling for international sanctions.

US imperialism thereby provided the material and technical facilities for one more of Israel's aggressions in the Middle East. With Israel the main bridgehead for America's strategic Middle East interests, wrote the Algerian *Al-Moudjahid*, Pretoria remained the guarantor of the main US interests in Africa.

Imperialists consider South Africa a strike force that will for many years ahead prevent decolonisation from being completed, and hinder the African countries' advance on the road of independence and social progress. Here, too, Reagan had a clear-cut stance even before being elected President. "Many Americans," he said, "have interpreted our interest in Africa as an extension of our own desire to achieve racial equality and elimination of injustice

¹ *International Herald Tribune*, August 17, 1979.

based on race. I am afraid that is a naive oversimplification of what really is at issue.”¹ On becoming President, Reagan proved by his “constructive engagement” with South Africa, that at least in this case his deeds matched his words. *Harper’s Magazine* pointed out that the policy of “constructive engagement” with Pretoria has produced nothing for the victims of apartheid. “Instead,” it added, “the regime continues to gas up more planes, load more guns, outfit more ships, assemble more jeeps”.²

Encouraged by its Western patrons, Pretoria does not hesitate to defy the international community by brazen acts of aggression against independent African countries. The facts are well known. In August 1981, more than 15,000 South African troops thrust into Angola. They occupied nearly 50,000 square kilometres in Angola’s Cunene Province, including the large towns of Njiva and Changongo. The whole world stood aghast. Yet the United States defended the aggressors. At an emergency meeting of the UN Security Council, the US representative placed the responsibility on Angola and SWAPO, and vetoed a resolution denouncing South Africa for its aggression.

South Africa followed up with more acts of aggression against Angola. Mozambique, Lesotho, the Seychelles, and Zimbabwe, and other African states became frequent targets of attack and sabotage. The aim behind this is to impose the imperialists’ will on sovereign countries.

Pretoria is as interested as Washington in a dependable alliance, for this would enable it to commit its racist crimes with impunity. As noted by the UN Special Committee against Apartheid in its report to the 39th General Assembly in November 1984, the US Administration opposed or frustrated all effective international acts against Pretoria’s aggressions.

P. W. Botha’s regime describes Tel Aviv policy as an “appropriate model” for South Africa. “Like Israel,” Botha says, “white South Africa is essentially a small, wealthy, productive, modern society surrounded by hostile territories

¹ *Africa Report*, No. 4, 1980.

² *Harper’s Magazine*, December 1984.

which are poorer and short of both technology and skilled manpower.”¹

Borrowing Israel's experience, Pretoria tried to create a situation in Angola resembling that of Lebanon. A plan was worked out to establish a state there (Ovamboland) subordinate to South Africa. It was to consist of Angola's southern provinces and the northern part of Namibia. And Jonas Savimbi, chief of the UNITA bandits, was to play the part that Major Saad Haddad played in Lebanon.

Another parallel may be drawn with respect to South Africa's response to the demands for withdrawing its troops from Namibia: prompted by Washington, it said it would withdraw its troops as soon as the Cuban contingent (stationed in Angola at the request of its government to defend its sovereignty) would be withdrawn. This linkage may be likened to Israel's demands concerning Syria's units stationed in Lebanon under an Arab League mandate.

These “linkages” are being used to drag out the respective conflicts. If they were accepted by the other side, the aggressors would be equally pleased, for that would add to the fruits of their aggression.

The behaviour of Tel Aviv and Pretoria, which are Washington's junior partners, shows that they employ similar methods and pursue similar aims in the struggle against the national liberation movement and the progressive states of Africa and the Middle East. *Sechaba*, organ of the African National Congress, noted that Tel Aviv and Pretoria have common “higher” interests, that both are built on racist principles, both rely on bayonets, and both are closely associated with imperialism.

One of the major reasons for the close relationship between the rulers of Israel and South Africa is their growing isolation on the international scene. Their reactionary home and foreign policy has led to mounting opposition by all progressives, with the result, among others, that

¹ Robert S. Jaster, *South Africa's Narrowing Security Options*, International Institute for Strategic Studies, London, 1980, p. 44.

many countries have broken off diplomatic relations with them and are boycotting them economically and politically.

To understand the reasons why South Africa and Israel collaborate so closely, we must also remember that both were instituted with the immediate encouragement of international imperialism—the former under the South Africa Act of 1909, and the latter under the Balfour Declaration of 1917, which envisaged a Jewish state in Palestine. From the outset, both acts impinged upon the lawful interests of the African population (in southern Africa) and the Arab people of Palestine (in the Middle East), but conformed with imperialism's geopolitical strategy. Back in 1917, General Jan Smuts, who would later become Prime Minister of South Africa, established friendly contacts with Chaim Weizmann, President of the British Zionist Federation and subsequently first president of the State of Israel. As a special delegate of the British government and member of the War Cabinet, Smuts employed his power and influence to prevail on Great Britain that it should officially endorse the concept of a Jewish national home in Palestine. Weizmann, in turn, went out of his way to connect the establishment of a Jewish state with the imperial interests of the West in general, and those of Britain in particular. The US journal, *Southern Africa*, noted that both Smuts and Weizmann had pursued the aim of vesting South Africa and Israel, respectively, with the strategic function of safeguarding Western global interests.

In the final analysis, indeed, it is monopoly capital that determines the policy of both Israel and South Africa, since their economies are largely dependent on it. US and West European business, for its part, has a stake in the expansion of South Africa and Israel, because the racists of either country protect its interests in the struggle against the national liberation movement—the interests of profiting from the exploitation of African states.

A big part in promoting Tel Aviv's cooperation with Pretoria is played by Zionist and pro-Zionist groups in South Africa. At present, we learn from *Domingo*, a Mozambique journal, the Jewish community in South Afri-

ca numbers 140,000 and plays a prominent part in the country's economy and political affairs.

The Jewish community in South Africa dates to the end of the past century, when it consisted mainly of persons persecuted for their religious convictions in various European countries. The first Zionist organisations sprang up in Cape Town in 1897, and a year later in Johannesburg. By the end of 1898 there were at least twelve of them in the country. They formed a single South African Zionist Federation, which soon gained predominance in the Jewish community.

The ruling Nationalist Party of South Africa, which was connected with the Nazis during World War II and whose members were generally believed to be fiercely anti-Semitic, began flirting with the South African Zionists in anticipation of the general elections of 1948. On coming to power, it cooperated with the Zionists officially. By that time, the Jewish community was so strongly entrenched in the country's economy that any attempt at interfering with its traditional patterns would have had grave consequences.

The participation of the Jewish community in the brutal exploitation of the indigenous African population led to its complete acceptance of the system of apartheid reigning in the country. The racists and Zionists consigned the former anti-Semitism of the ruling party to oblivion. Jews were allowed to join the Nationalist Party and to occupy important offices in the government. In return, the Zionist leaders expressed full support for racial discrimination and the oppression of the indigenous population. Today, when apartheid is being condemned everywhere, the Zionists in South Africa are doing what they can to make the image of the racist regime less obnoxious. Even when monstrous crimes were committed against humanity, as was the case in Sharpeville in 1960, the Zionists assumed a posture of tacit approval.

Israel Goldstein, a leader of the World Jewish Congress, said after a trip to South Africa at the end of 1959 that "the zeal for the Zionist cause" among Jews in South Africa "has been greater than that of any other Jewish community". He said this could be judged from the fact

that South African Jews regularly attended services at the synagogue, were giving their children a Jewish and Zionist education, and that the South African contribution to Zionist funds has been second only to that of the United States.

There were some 118,000 Jews in South Africa in 1948, who zealously backed the Zionist cause. Their contribution to Zionist funds per head of the Jewish population, was three times larger than that of US Jews.¹

There has been considerable cross-migration between Israel and South Africa. It was estimated that as many as 25,000 Israelis live in South Africa today, going there mostly to work on government-to-government contracts, especially on arms and energy projects. In the opposite direction, some 8,500 South African Jews live in Israel. Many went there out of simple Zionist convictions.²

In many ways, it was the Jewish community that furthered government-to-government relations between Israel and South Africa. Backed by Zionist groups within the Jewish community of South Africa, the Nationalist Party recognised Israel *de jure* in 1948, and established diplomatic relations with it. Two years later, Israeli Prime Minister Moshe Sharett paid an official visit to South Africa. In 1953, South Africa's Prime Minister Daniel Malan became the first foreign head of government to visit Israel. He was received as a close friend.

Exchanges of delegations at summit level began. Bilateral cooperation increased. On returning from Israel, Malan permitted South African reservists of Jewish origin to serve in Israel's armed forces, though this was contrary to international law and the UN Charter. He also permitted export of currency and consumer goods to Israel despite his country's own serious financial difficulties.

According to the International Monetary Fund, South African trade with Israel is minute, representing only 0.6 per cent of the former's total exports and only 0.5 per cent of its imports.³ It should be remembered, however, that

¹ *The Sunday Times*, April 15, 1984.

² *Ibid.*

³ *The Sunday Times*, April 15, 1984.

these official figures take no account of the trade in diamonds or military equipment. Military sales are considered too sensitive to be discussed publicly, while all South African diamond sales to any country are confidential. It is safe to say, therefore, that the trade between the two countries is far from insignificant and that Israel is in fact South Africa's largest trading partner. In 1983, the Israeli government announced, indeed, that total trade with South Africa amounted to 252 million dollars, or to nearly two-thirds of Israel's trade with Africa.

The cutting and polishing of diamonds was one of the first industries to be established in Israel when the Oppenheimer family, who control De Beers, one of the largest diamond corporations in the world closely connected with US transnationals, granted Israel generous terms. The manufacture of industrial diamonds currently involves 15,000 people and is the second largest export earner (military sales being the largest) in Israel. From diamonds the two countries went on to building up their relationships in many other areas. These days, South Africa supplies practically all of Israel's needs in coal, while Israel sells South Africa electronic equipment, textiles, chemicals, and agricultural products.

For South Africa, trade with Israel has special attractions, since the latter has preferential access to EEC countries and the United States. Goods made in Israel or with an Israeli-added value of 40-50 per cent, are eligible for duty-free entry into the EEC, while 2,700 Israeli-manufactured products are permitted free entry into the United States.

Semi-processed iron and steel is shipped from South Africa to Israel, finished at the Iskoor factory near Tel Aviv, and then shipped on to Europe or America with a "Made in Israel" stamp. This is one way South Africa uses Israel as an outlet for economic penetration abroad. Pretoria exports raw materials to Israel with the aim of shipping them further under the Israeli flag.

Apart from commerce, Israel and South Africa have a stake in bilateral export of capital, in setting up joint industrial ventures, mixed banking groups, and so on.

The interest that South African businessmen have in the Israeli market was demonstrated at the international economic conference of billionaires, attended by 50 leading South African bankers and industrialists, in Israel in the summer of 1973. At the conference they concluded a number of highly profitable transactions, including a contract to build a cotton factory in Israel. Israeli experts at Tadiran, Elbit, and Israel Aircraft Industries, the country's three leading electro-technical companies, pooled efforts to help South Africa design and build its own electro-technical enterprises. At present, part of the goods manufactured at these enterprises, namely radio receivers, field telephones and monitoring systems, are being exported. Israel and South Africa carried through a few more joint projects, such as building a railway line from Elat to Beersheba, petro-chemical plants in Israel, and the like. The bilateral Tel Aviv-Pretoria economic integration has one strategic aim: to blunt the effects of the economic embargo on trade with Israel and South Africa by international organisations.

The military cooperation between Pretoria and Tel Aviv is based on the common reactionary essence and aggressiveness of their ideologies and politics, their readiness to act as an imperialist police force. Small wonder that the increasing military cooperation between Israel and South Africa, and their joint actions against the national liberation movement, are fully supported and approved by the West. The *Jornal de Angola* reported that the criminal cooperation of those two bitterest enemies of the African peoples furnishes added proof that racists and Zionists, who rely on the backing of their Western patrons, think nothing of defying UN resolutions forbidding arms sales to apartheid South Africa and establishing a trade embargo.

Israel's military cooperation with South Africa is a permanent feature. There are mutual arms deliveries, participation of servicemen in military actions of the other country, extensive exchanges of military information and intelligence, coordinated action in the framework of NATO's strategic plans, and exchanges of expertise and military experts.

The inception of this military alliance goes back to the Arab-Israeli war of 1948-49. At that time, South Africa rendered Israel military support: it sent a unit of Jewish volunteers there, along with medical supplies and military equipment. According to the *Algérie-Actualité* weekly, the number of South African war pilots who flew Israeli planes was second only to that of United States pilots.

The Arab-Israeli wars gave South Africa a chance to show its support of Israel by sending it money and arms. In 1967, for example, the Vorster government permitted South African Jews to transfer an emergency sum of 20.5 million dollars to Israel, while several hundred South African Jews went to fight for Israel or to help keep essential services in operation. Pretoria also shipped to Israel a large quantity of arms and aircraft.¹

South Africa reacted similarly to the 1973 October war, announcing that it would help Israel in every possible way. More than 1,500 Jewish volunteers with Zionist leanings from South Africa joined the Israeli armed forces, while the Jewish community poured out of South Africa more than 30 million dollars in contributions to Israel.²

The expanding military, political and economic cooperation between Israel and South Africa caused legitimate alarm in the world at large. In 1973, the UN condemned the alliance of South African racism and Israeli expansionism. But the alliance continued to thrive. Israeli officers are permanently stationed in South Africa to help train its ground forces, and naval and air-force personnel. The two countries maintain a lively exchange of intelligence. As noted in the Italian journal, *Panorama*, South Africans have access to intelligence collected by Mossad agents in America, Europe and, above all, Africa. Mossad, in turn, has free access to the electronic surveillance base in Silvermine, South Africa, which monitors shipping and air traffic in the triangle formed by the South Pole, South America, and the Mozambique Channel.³

¹ *The Sunday Times*, April 15, 1984.

² *Ibid.*

³ *Panorama*, August 20, 1984.

Mossad experts help the South African racists to combat internal ANC and guerrilla operations. Israeli experts train South African army and special police units. All South Africa is organised on principles applied by Israel on the West Bank and in Southern Lebanon. Israeli experts pass on their experience of combatting the PLO. Several hundred high-ranking South African police officials visited Israel to acquaint themselves with the methods used there to suppress unrest. It is not surprising, therefore, that the classic Israeli anti-guerrilla warfare doctrine—harass the enemy wherever he happens to be, even outside the legal frontiers—is at present applied in South Africa, too. Adopting the Israeli tactic of invading neighbouring territories, the South Africans mount similar bandit actions against their own neighbours.

Israel played a prominent part in establishing “effective border patrolling” in South Africa. Israeli experts visited the border region and recommended various precautionary measures. In return, various Israeli firms received several million-dollar contracts. Now South African border units have night vision devices, USW search and destroy systems, electronic monitoring systems and anti-personnel mines—all made in Israel.

In 1977, the UN set an embargo on arms shipments to South Africa. Officially, Israel acknowledged this resolution, but is ignoring it in fact. As before, arms are being illegally shipped to South Africa—and not only from Israel, but also from the United States, Britain, France and the FRG. Often enough, Tel Aviv acts as the middleman.

Rotoflight Helicopters of Capetown and Israel's Chevavir-Masok have jointly developed the Scorpion helicopter used by the armed forces of both countries.

South Africa is helping to design and build airfields in Israel, while buying large numbers of Israeli Arava planes equipped with early-warning systems, and Kfir planes, whose engines are made in the United States. *The Sunday Times* reports that “South Africa is known to be prepared to invest in the Israeli fighter, code-named Lavi or Lion, which has not yet entered production.” This, the paper added, would be the most significant joint venture to date,

giving the two countries access to a most sophisticated fighter aircraft.¹

In 1976, following a week's visit of South Africa's Prime Minister Vorster to Israel, an understanding was reached that South Africa would buy three Reshef patrol boats from Israel and build another ten such boats at the Sandock-Austral shipyards in Durban. The boats will be armed with Gabriel missiles made in South Africa under an Israeli licence.

The combination of South African finance and Israeli technology is enabling the two countries to develop new types of weapons, including a nuclear-capable mobile artillery device.

Tel Aviv's nuclear weapons cooperation with Pretoria is carried on under a dense veil of secrecy. Obviously encouraged by the Western powers, notably the United States, this cooperation began in the 1960s and has now attained large proportions. As early as 1968, Professor Ernst Bergmann, father of Israel's nuclear programme, told an audience at the South African Institute of International Affairs in Johannesburg that "in general I have found that, in nuclear physics, the two countries are verging on, not only similar, but almost identical, lines." He said he had discussed with many of his colleagues the value of collaboration between the two countries. "I was glad," he added, "to find a very enthusiastic response".²

In the simplest terms, this cooperation is an exchange of Israeli technology for South African enriched uranium, subsequently used at Israeli atomic projects in the Negev desert. Reports of this first appeared in 1977, when a large number of observers arrived at the conclusion that South Africa was ready to explode a nuclear device.

The Soviet Union pointed out in a TASS statement of August 9, 1977: "It is believed in the Soviet Union that urgent and effective efforts of all countries, of the UN, and of the world public, are essential in order to prevent South Africa from developing nuclear weapons. The danger of their proliferation must be ended. The Soviet Union, which

¹ *The Sunday Times*, April 15, 1984.

² *Ibid.*

firmly works to prevent nuclear war, is prepared, for its part, to assist in securing this aim together with other countries."

But the criminal connivance of the imperialist powers, as noted by Ronald Walters of Howard University (Washington, D.C.), and the substantial part played by the United States, France, the FRG, Britain and Israel in building up South Africa's military and nuclear power by supplying special nuclear materials, technologies and equipment, and rendering scientific and economic aid, has enabled Pretoria to produce its own nuclear potential. A report of an international UN group of experts noted that Pretoria had enough enriched uranium to manufacture seven or eight nuclear bombs as far back as 1979. By the end of that year, artificial satellites registered a blast resembling a nuclear explosion in the Southern Atlantic. This was believed to have been a joint Israeli-South African test of a two to four kiloton tactical nuclear device. *The Daily Telegraph* reported that the CIA confirmed the fact to a US Congress committee. CBS News reported that "Israel exploded a nuclear bomb . . . in the Atlantic Ocean off the coast of South Africa . . . with the help and cooperation of the South African government".¹

The nuclear ambitions of Tel Aviv and Pretoria, encouraged by Washington, present a tangible danger. It is particularly disturbing that the South African racists have acknowledged the American concept of "limited nuclear conflict". According to the South Africa variant, as we learn from the *Johannesburg Star*, mass destruction weapons are to be used in areas of bitter fighting within the country or on its borders, against enemy camps and bases in neighbouring states, and against the capitals of countries that give shelter or aid to the enemy.

The racist plans have Washington's approval and backing. Better to take part in South Africa's nuclear programme than to ignore it, is the United States' explanation of its posture. It has thereby admitted that it has given the reactionary regime the big nuclear stick, and that it is an

¹ *The Washington Post*, February 22, 1980.

accomplice in the racists' past, present and future crimes against peace and the liberty of nations.

The strategic alliance of international imperialism, Zionism, and racism is designed to keep newly-free countries within the world capitalist economy as suppliers of raw materials, manpower and natural resources. It is aimed at forcing these countries to follow the imperialist policy, to work against all revolutionary processes and all progressive socio-economic change. The alliance is thus spear-headed against the national-liberation and anti-imperialist struggle of the peoples of Africa and the Middle East, against peace and international security.

A. Yegoshkin

THE HISTORY OF FRG-ISRAEL RELATIONS

On November 11, 1949, in an interview to a weekly of the West German Jewish community the then Chancellor Konrad Adenauer said the outside world would, evidently, recognise Israel as the home of the Jews of all countries, and offered it a "gift" of ten million marks as a token of goodwill. This, in effect, was the first step towards reconciliation and close contacts. The moment the FRG was formed, its government had cast about for diplomatic and economic relations with Israel, and for the following reasons:

First, reconciliation with Israel would help politically rehabilitate West Germany in the international arena, and indicate the FRG's rejection of the Nazis' treatment of Jews.

Second, it would neutralise the anti-German propaganda of Zionist and other Jewish organisations gravely damaging to West Germany's international prestige.

Third, ties with monopolists of Jewish background, especially in the United States, would substantially benefit West Germany's economy.

Fourth, financial and economic relations with Israel would, in the long term, mean additional possibilities for marketing West German goods, and technologically tie the weak Israeli economy to the FRG.

It stands to reason, the West German ruling elements knew that reconciliation was not simple to achieve. They were aware of the feelings that the very mention of Germany aroused among most people in Israel. The memory of the six million Jews exterminated by the Nazis was a

serious obstacle to Adenauer's plans. It was clear that no Israeli government, even that of cynical pragmatist David Ben-Gurion, would consent to have public contacts with the FRG, even if this meant receiving considerable reparations, and compensations for the injury done to Jews during World War II. Characteristic here is the statement of a member of Knesset in 1951: "It's too much of an honour to accept German money."

The Adenauer government, however, was not discouraged. It was sure, that despite the abhorrence of the Israeli public, Ben-Gurion's government would not in the long run be able to ignore the offer of considerable and badly needed sums of money. Furthermore, the US rulers and certain Zionist leaders abroad had set out to assist an Israel-West Germany reconciliation. Following heated discussions in the Knesset, Israel agreed to negotiate. The talks in The Hague from March to August 1952 led up to a treaty signed in Luxembourg on September 10, 1952. Under that treaty, the FRG was to pay Israel 3 billion marks in reparations in kind, with an Israeli trade mission being set up in West Germany. What the treaty meant for the FRG Konrad Adenauer said in his memoirs: "I was aware that if we succeeded in resolving the problems with Israel and Jewish (read Zionist—A.Y.) world organisations, this would be equal in importance for the Federal Republic to at least the conclusion of a German peace treaty."¹ Apart from the political advantages, mainly political rehabilitation in the international arena, the Federal Republic would also get a number of economic benefits.

The Luxembourg treaty was the basis for the two countries' relations until the mid-1960s. It gave the start to a period of "special relations" between the FRG and Israel. Formally, it stood for the admission of German "collective culpability" and an "unrepayable moral debt" to Jews, whose interests under the Zionist dogma of a "worldwide Jewish nation" were represented by Israel. In substance, the FRG government was the first to officially acknowledge Israel's right to act "on behalf of the Jews of all the

¹ *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, October 14, 1957.

world". Still, despite Israel's consent to establish full-scale diplomatic relations in 1956, Bonn was not yet ready for it. Fears that this might have negative consequences for FRG relations with the Arab countries had priority over "moral duty". Adenauer's conversations with Ben-Gurion in New York in March 1960 did not culminate in the establishment of diplomatic relations either. Still, they resulted in a secret agreement concerning a 240-million-mark delivery of West German arms to Israel.

At that time, the FRG was doing a balancing act between the Arab countries and Israel. The state and volume of its economic and political relations with the Arab countries was yielding the FRG tangible economic advantages, and indeed, secured support for its basic political conceptions in the Arab East. This concerned Arab support of the Hallstein Doctrine¹, which was then the cornerstone of West German foreign relations. Besides, relations with Israel were only just beginning to approach the level that conformed with Adenauer's aims. This was why Bonn, in effect, pretended to ignore the existence of the Mid-East conflict and sought to maintain good relations with both sides.

The FRG's dual Mid-East policy ended when Gamal Abdel Nasser, President of Egypt, invited Walter Ulbricht, Chairman of the State Council of the GDR, to visit Cairo following press revelations of West German military supplies being sent to Israel. Bonn's attempts to make Nasser withdraw the invitation failed, signalling the beginning of the end for the Hallstein Doctrine in the Arab countries. As a result, the FRG ventured on establishing diplomatic relations with Israel on May 12, 1965. In reply, ten out of the thirteen Arab League countries recalled their ambassadors from Bonn.

Following the establishment of diplomatic relations, West German-Israeli ties expanded intensively. Both politically

¹ One of the basic foreign-policy guidelines of the FRG governments headed by the CDU/CSU bloc in 1949-69. It represented the FRG government's claim to being the sole representative of Germans.

and economically. Still, despite the deep crisis in its relations with the Arab East, the FRG preferred to avoid any new complications. The Hallstein Doctrine and recognition of the GDR by the Arab countries were still a highly sensitive issue, however. This was why, despite supporting Israel economically and politically, Kurt Kiesinger's government, which came to power in 1966, declared itself neutral vis-à-vis the Middle East conflict. This neutrality was formally maintained during the June war of 1967. In fact, however, Bonn did not halt its economic aid to Tel Aviv during and after that war, and acted hand in hand with the USA in international organisations. This led to the final collapse of the Hallstein Doctrine in the Arab East.

The clear stand of the GDR government on the Middle East conflict was acknowledged by the Arab leaders. In 1969, the German Democratic Republic was recognised by Iraq, Sudan, South Yemen, and the United Arab Republic. The Kiesinger government retaliated by reducing its aid to Arab countries. On June 17, 1969, Kiesinger declared that the Arab countries' recognition of the GDR "had been damaging to the right of the German nation to self-determination". He also said normal relations with them would not be possible until they changed their attitude.¹

Yet a normalisation did come, but it came after the FRG itself adjusted its position. The Willy Brandt-Walter Scheel government that took over at the end of 1969 adopted realistic political conceptions. The FRG renounced its former policy on the German question, and, in particular, the Hallstein Doctrine. The main effort during the early period of Brandt's cabinet, it is true, was confined to the European continent. But the wish to normalise relations with the Arab countries was sounded in its very first public utterances. On October 28, 1969, Chancellor Brandt officially described UN Security Council Resolution No. 242 as "suited to the interests of the nations concerned", and voiced the wish to have good relations with all Mid-East

¹ *Bulletin des Presse und Informationsamtes der Bundesregierung*, No. 87, June 18, 1969, pp. 669-670.

countries.¹ This was the time of what came to be known as West Germany's "balanced" Middle East policy. On June 5, 1970, a statement concerning Middle East affairs declared "maintenance, and restoration where necessary, of friendship with Arab countries" to be the main aim. Yet the same statement reaffirmed the FRG's special commitments to Israel.

Bonn said maintenance of full-scale relations with the Arab countries, as well as Israel, conformed with its intentions and neutrality in Middle East affairs. Along with its efforts to secure a rapprochement with the Arab countries (which yielded tangible results by 1972), the FRG also continued its all-round relationship with Israel.

In 1970, Foreign Minister Abba Eban paid the first official Israeli visit to Bonn. In July 1971, West German Foreign Minister Walter Scheel reciprocated in kind.

The period of "special" West German-Israeli relations ended in the early 1970s. Diplomatic relations had been consolidated by then, and economic ties too. In effect, international Zionism and the Israeli rulers had rehabilitated the moral image of the FRG. The aim West Germany had set itself was thus attained. FRG-Israeli ties were solid. Now Israel was the side that had a greater stake in expanding them. The main reason was that financial and economic aid had grown more vital since the 1967 war. Conversely, the FRG's positions in relation to Israel were stronger than before. Having announced the launching of its "balanced" policy in the Middle East, West Germany sought to renounce the "special nature" of its relations with Tel Aviv. In June 1973, Willy Brandt paid an official visit to Israel. This was the first visit by a head of government since the two countries had established relations, and it was therefore considered highly important. The Israeli leaders wanted the West German Chancellor to confirm the "special nature" of the two countries' relations, and meant to ask

¹ UN Security Council Resolution No. 242 of November 22, 1967, demands withdrawal of Israeli armed forces from all territories occupied during the Israeli 1967 aggression as the basic condition for a political settlement in the Middle East.

for more West German aid. As before, Tel Aviv claimed to represent the interests of the Jews of all the world.

But if in the early 1970s Golda Meir's cabinet managed to receive additional FRG funds, ostensibly as "compensations" to Jews who had come from socialist countries now Brandt let his intention to refuse paying more compensations be known in advance. "We must not look back", he said, "we must look forward".¹ This was an unambiguous hint that the Chancellor did not intend to uphold the "moral commitments" of Adenauer's time. He gave the Israeli leaders to understand that West Germany could not promise to support Israel. Ever since then, and even more frequently following the 1973 October War, West Germany has been saying its relations with Israel had become "normal", that is, that they were no longer special.

Israel, on the other hand, did its utmost to squash this interpretation. Practically every Israeli statement addressed to West Germany contained references, even if oblique, to the sinister events of the Nazi period. "It was no accident," the *Frankfurter Rundschau* commented during Yitzchak Rabin's visit to the FRG in 1975, "that the Israeli Prime Minister had, before beginning his talks, visited the monument to Nazi victims in the Bergen-Belsen concentration camp."² Naturally, the Israeli ambassador in Bonn, Yohanan Meroz, followed the same line. Here is how he described the relations between his country and West Germany: "I am quite prepared, with pleasure and conviction, to use positive adjectives in describing German-Israeli relations. I really do believe that these relations are good, meaningful, useful, and everything else. Though, in forms, they have been fully normalised, they are not yet normal, and cannot be so owing to their tragic background."³

The continuous references to the tragic past were evidently prompted by the weakness of Tel Aviv's positions. Tel Aviv wanted to induce the FRG thereby to at least

¹ *Stern*, May 30, 1973.

² *Frankfurter Rundschau*, July 9, 1975.

³ *Europa-Union*, Bonn, February 1977.

abstain from supporting the Arabs if it did not support Israel.

The aggressive expansionist policy of the Israeli rulers is contrary to the interests of the people of Israel and those of Jews living in other countries. It is clear, however, that this was not the reason why the FRG moved away from its "special relations". Essentially, "special relations" were incompatible with Bonn's new Middle East policy. And the 1973 October War forced West Germany to abandon its pro-Israeli posture. At the height of the war, on October 16, it refused to permit use of its territory for air-lifts of US arms to Israel.

And after the war, when the EEC countries published their joint Middle East statement, the Israeli leadership, though it did express its displeasure, was compelled for a time to suffer the prevailing state of affairs.

There was relative stagnation in FRG-Israel relations in 1974. The FRG was occupied mending matters with the Arab countries, and managed to resume diplomatic relations with many of them. But in early 1975 contacts between Tel Aviv and Bonn became livelier. The Israeli leadership wanted to make up for its increasing political isolation worldwide by expanding ties with the FRG.

When Helmut Schmidt became Chancellor, Israeli observers said hopefully his "Atlantic tendency", as compared with the "continental French orientation of his predecessor", would yield Israel considerable advantages because fewer differences could be expected between the FRG and USA, and, consequently, Israel.¹

At the end of February 1975, Israeli Foreign Minister Yigal Allon visited the FRG. He was to obtain help for combatting Israel's economic crisis and to secure closer connections with EEC. Bonn promised to study the possibility of an additional payment to Israel of 600 million marks in compensations to Jews whose claims had not yet been honoured. And on May 11, 1975, thanks above all to FRG efforts, a free trade and cooperation agree-

¹ *Die Welt*, January 7, 1975.

ment was signed between the EEC and Israel in Brussels.

By mid-1975, the FRG government had improved its relations with the Arab countries to a point where it no longer feared complications. Now it was able to receive Israeli Prime Minister Yitzchak Rabin. The talks with him centred on the Middle East situation and the planned military disengagement between Israel and Egypt in Sinai. To be sure, the Israeli Prime Minister sought at least tacit FRG support, and if possible also FRG aid in soliciting the support of other EEC countries, for the impending agreement on this score. And his request was granted: the FRG came out with an appropriate statement.

Israel had at all times actively backed the Hallstein Doctrine. Naturally, this was not done solely out of solidarity with the West German philosophy or out of a desire to strengthen bilateral ties. Israel had had material claims to the German Democratic Republic. One of the drafts of the Treaty of Luxembourg, as conceived by the Israelis, required the GDR to assume responsibility for about one-third of the payments. The German Democratic Republic, on the other hand, while prepared to recognise Israel and to have equitable relations with it, refused to recognise its right to "represent the interests of the Jews of all the world", and also to pay any compensations, because it was not a legal successor of Hitler Germany and bore no responsibility for its misdeeds. That was the main reason why Tel Aviv sided with the Hallstein Doctrine. Even after that doctrine was scrapped, the Israeli leaders continued to back it. In July 1975, for example, Israel voted against the GDR's admission to the United Nations.

In the summer of 1975 a temporary stabilisation occurred between the FRG and Israel. Having normalised its relations with the Arab countries and largely eliminated the threat of an oil boycott, West Germany adopted a wait-and-see attitude with regard to the US-inspired moves for a separate phased Middle-East "settlement". The Israelis, for their part, had obtained as much as they could have expected—that is, in economic aid—from the FRG. Between November 1975 and June 1976 the two countries concluded a set of agreements, namely, on terms protecting

and guaranteeing investments, and on 140-million marks' worth of West German economic aid in 1976.

During Hans-Dietrich Genscher's visit to Israel in November 1975, the Israelis did not remonstrate against his general and cautious utterances on the Palestinian question. The FRG Foreign Minister said, for example, that the Palestinian problem was the key issue in the Middle East conflict, and that it would be only right to recognise the right of the people of Palestine to express their national identity "without prejudicing Israel's right to existence".¹

But in January 1976 a minor crisis erupted when during Prince Feisal's visit to the FRG, Genscher made certain "amendments" concerning West Germany's stand on the Middle East for the benefit of the Saudi Arabian foreign minister. He said, among other things, that his country wanted Israel to withdraw from all occupied territories and to respect the right of the Arab people of Palestine to establish their own state in those territories.² The Israeli government immediately inquired if Bonn had changed its attitude to "Israel's detriment".³ In the FRG, too, Genscher's "amendments" came under fire by the CDU/CSU. Richard von Weizsäcker, CDU Bundestag deputy, expressed his faction's surprise over Bonn's departure from its "balanced" policy, while Werner Marx, foreign-policy spokesman of the CDU/CSU, declared that the "amendments" had been "unnecessary, unuseful, and inappropriate coming from a German".⁴

As a result, Bonn was compelled to state that, despite the "amendments", its general Middle-East stand had not changed and it was carrying on with its "balanced" policy. Furthermore, in a talk on the following day with Israeli Ambassador Yohanan Meroz, Genscher said his utterances during Prince Feisal's visit should not be regarded as a reference to Israel's borders, and that the issue could be settled only by those involved in the Middle-East conflict,

¹ *Die Welt*, November 29, 1975.

² *Münchener Merkur*, January 27, 1976.

³ *Die Welt*, January 27, 1976.

⁴ *Frankfurter Rundschau*, January 27, 1976.

first of all Israel.¹ The "misunderstanding" was thus consigned to oblivion.

During the lively West German "peace-making" efforts in early 1977, Bonn continued to maintain close contacts with Tel Aviv. Shortly before his trip to Egypt, Syria and Jordan, Genscher had a meeting with Allon in Brussels, to discuss the Middle-East situation. The Israeli Foreign Minister was sceptical as to West Germany's diplomatic moves, and feared the Federal Republic's vulnerability to the oil weapon, like that of other West European countries, made the success of its efforts highly dubious. Israel, he said, expected a political settlement in the Middle East to come about through the efforts of the United States.²

Still, during Genscher's visit to Israel in March 1977, the Israelis showed a most lively interest in the results of his Middle East junket. He informed them that in the opinion of the Arab leaders Israel's policy of building settlements in occupied territories placed in question its readiness for an accord. The Israelis explained evasively in their reply that their settlements policy was no more than "a thing of the intermediate period".³

Zionist leaders complimented Bonn effusively for its aid in working out their new economic accord with the EEC. The accord consisted of two additional protocols to the 1977 treaty, chiefly aimed at increasing Israeli exports to Western Europe and thereby reducing its balance of trade deficit. The protocols envisaged help in building up-to-date chemical, electro-technical and aircraft enterprises in Israel. They also provided for assistance in solar energy development, and the like. The European Investment Bank granted Israel some 33 million dollars worth of credit.

When Menachem Begin's extreme rightist cabinet came to power in Israel in May 1977 and intensified Zionist annexationist activity, this complicated West German political manoeuvring in the Middle East. Bonn's hopes of an early Israeli-Arab political settlement according to an

¹ *Die Welt*, January 28, 1976.

² *Die Rheinpfalz*, March 16, 1977.

³ *General Anzriger*, March 15, 1977.

American scenario, collapsed. For tactical reasons, the social-democratic leadership and official Bonn preferred to disavow Tel Aviv's expansionist policy.

Genscher's utterances at the 32nd UN General Assembly were sharply attacked in Israel. Tel Aviv said they were contrary to the peace efforts in the Middle East, and also contrary to the friendship that prevailed between Israel and the FRG. The reason for this outburst was that Genscher had referred to the Palestinians' right to statehood and criticised the Israeli settlements policy in occupied territories.

Egyptian President Anwar Sadat's visit to Jerusalem in November 1977, his separatist move which disrupted the united front of Arab states, enabled the FRG to restore its former relations with Israel. Following Sadat's initiative, the Israeli leadership decided to consolidate its success and win West European support by exploiting its effects.

On November 27, 1977, Israeli Foreign Minister Moshe Dayan arrived in the FRG. During his visit, the Begin-Sadat meeting was described as a "bold and forward-looking" step.¹ At the same time, Bonn called for Israeli flexibility that would pave the way to a multilateral solution also encompassing the Palestinian issue.² Dayan declared that success depended largely on third countries, and called on the FRG "to render moral and political support to Egypt and its allies" and "to act against those who obstruct peace". He gave to understand that Israel considered West Germany the key member of the EEC. "Bonn's differentiated Middle East policy," he said, "would inevitably lead to a change in EEC policy."³

West Germany's reaction to "Sadat's initiative!", however, underwent an abrupt change from excessive delight to restrained scepticism, when it became clear Western hopes that leaders of certain other countries would join Sadat, had fallen through. The Arab rejection of Egypt's new line and fear for the future of its relations with the Arab

¹ *Die Welt*, November 29, 1977.

² *Süddeutsche Zeitung*, November 29, 1977.

³ *Frankfurter Allgemeine*, November 30, 1977.

East, prompted Bonn to extreme caution. But this did not prevent it from appointing Klaus Schütz, the former mayor of West Berlin known for his pro-Israel views, ambassador to Israel.

Genscher's third visit to Israel took place on June 28-30, 1978. This time, he was taken to task for Chancellor Schmidt's statement about the Palestinians' right "to organise themselves as a state".¹ Dayan reminded Genscher of Germany's "historical responsibility to Israel" and said any Palestinian state on the West Bank would work against Israel's security because, as he alleged, it would never be a real state and would one day serve as a bridgehead for an attack on Israel. Genscher had had to make amends.

In September 1978, after the Camp David phase had begun in the separate Israeli-Egyptian talks under patronage of the US President, fresh hopes sprang up in Bonn about their success, fired by the active involvement in the talks of the US Administration. Still the FRG continued its cautious policy.

In particular, Bonn announced its intention to postpone Schmidt's visit to Israel, planned more than two years before in return for Rabin's visit to the FRG. Later, the postponement developed into a grave problem in Israeli-West German relations. The Israelis took this as a sign of restraint towards the separate negotiations and as evidence of Schmidt's reluctance to support them publicly. Political commentators accentuated attention to the postponement, because Bonn had acted despite American pressure to the contrary.

As the difficulties over the widely advertised "peace treaty" between Egypt and Israel escalated, so did Tel Aviv's pressure on the West German leaders. The Israelis requested the FRG to join the process of the Egyptian-Israeli settlement. In a talk with Genscher in Brussels on December 22, 1978, Dayan urged him "to encourage Cairo on the road to peace".² This coincided in time with similar acts of the opposition in West Germany itself, and thus

¹ *Bonner Rundschau*, June 30, 1978.

² *Die Welt*, December 23, 1978.

acquired additional impact. But official Bonn would not abandon its caution, and took no action. On the whole, the West German stand could be described as a wait-and-see tactic right up to the Camp David signing of the "peace treaty" in March 1979.

The West German government's reaction to the separate treaty was a dual one. It praised its conclusion, on the one hand, but stressed, on the other, that its effects on the Middle-East situation would not be positive unless it became as step towards an all-embracing settlement. This West German view was backed up with a joint statement of the EEC countries on March 26, 1979.

Egypt and Israel asked Bonn to mediate between them and the Arab countries that had rejected the Camp David deal. Bonn consented. Its motivation: it wanted to help turn the "peace treaty" into an all-embracing settlement. That was the formal purpose of Genscher's visit to a number of Arab countries in June and July 1979. But the German foreign minister used the prevailing situation in the Arab world to buttress his country's positions there rather than propagate Camp David. The result: one more deterioration of relations between Bonn and Tel Aviv. It had been building up over the months, and the formal reason for it were the continual postponements of the FRG Chancellor's visit to Israel. The visit, as Tel Aviv saw it, would be most timely and useful now, after the signing of the Camp David agreement.

But Bonn would not be hurried. It explained the many postponements by its reluctance to add fuel to the fire at that stormy juncture in Mid-East affairs. According to Israeli ambassador in Bonn, Yohanan Meroz, Genscher had obstructed instead of furthering progress in the Cairo-Tel Aviv deal.

The Israeli leaders did not conceal their irritation with Genscher and other West German statesmen shaping the FRG's Mid-East policy, notably Hans-Jürgen Wischniewski, a foreign ministry official and one of the leaders of the S.D.P. And they were in a rage over the meeting in Vienna in July 1979 between S.D.P. Chairman and Socialist International President Willy Brandt and Yasser Arafat, chair-

man of the PLO Executive.¹ Shimon Peres, leader of the Knesset opposition, lost no time to say there was a "certain deterioration of relations" between the two countries.

The stresses and strains in West German-Israeli relations were due to more than just Tel Aviv's annoyance over Bonn's Mid-East policy. Bonn also voiced criticism of Israeli diplomacy, and this more and more often and more and more loudly. For it had much too frequently embarrassed the leaders of the FRG. Meroz, the Israeli ambassador in Bonn, among others, was frequently criticised for "going too far in his utterances". Meroz was reprimanded for criticising the West German leadership and thus adding to the strains in bilateral relations instead of smoothing things over. Yet in Tel Aviv's opinion, Meroz's tactics at that time had been just what was needed. The idea was to strain and dramatise relations to a point where it would be possible to accuse the FRG of falling down on its "unrepayable moral duty" to Israel.

The Jewish community in the FRG, too, went into action, though its political weight could not be compared to the influence of Zionist and other Jewish organisations in other West European countries or the USA. Still, acting through its press and its organisations, it was capable of influencing the political climate in the country to some extent.

Jews in the FRG numbered 29,000, though it would be a mistake to think that the majority of them sided with the Zionist or pro-Zionist organisations such as the Central Council of Jews in Germany or the German-Israeli Society, the latter, indeed, being of a distinctly Zionist complexion, and directed from Tel Aviv through the Israeli ambassador. It was the biggest and most influential Zionist organisation in the FRG, with some 2,000 members. As a rule, its functions were attended by prominent Israeli political leaders—ministers, members of Knesset, and so on. High-ranking Bonn officials, too, were usually invited. The impact made by the pro-Israel figures in the Jewish

¹ It was organised by the then Chancellor of Austria, Bruno Kreisky, Chairman of the Socialist Party of Austria, who also took part in the meeting.

community on the country's public opinion turned out to be fairly strong because their criticism of the government was backed by similar criticism on the part of the CDU/CSU.

The FRG government tried to dampen the strains with Israel and the leaders of international Zionist organisations. A Foreign Ministry official issued assurances that the Israeli ambassador enjoyed Bonn's complete trust and that the FRG regarded the relations of the two countries as invariably good. But this time official Bonn refrained from its previous encomiums vis-à-vis the Israeli leadership, showing thereby that its stand had toughened.

By mid-August 1979, the relations of the two countries went from bad to worse owing to a visit to the Middle East of Jürgen W. Möllemann, a conspicuous Free Democrats leader. Formally, he travelled as a private person and had no governmental or party powers. But this did not make Israel's objections to some of his utterances any the less sharp. Möllemann had, among other things, accused Israel of state terrorism against Palestinians and their camps in Lebanon. Speaking to PLO head Arafat, he suggested organising his meeting with spokesmen of the leading FRG political parties.

During the period of strained Tel Aviv-Bonn relations, the S.D.P. leadership vitalised its contacts with Mai, Israel's social-Zionist Labour Party, affiliated with the Socialist International. Israeli members of the working group formed by the S.D.P. and Mai during the visit to Israel of Herbert Wehner, Chairman of the S.D.P. parliamentary party, at the end of 1978, were invited to come to Bonn for consultations. But this did not eliminate the tensions between the two countries. On the contrary, the tensions grew more acute during Dayan's September 1979 visit to Bonn.

"That visit was a total failure," commented Hildegard Hamm-Brücher, a high-ranking FRG Foreign Ministry official.¹ During the talks, the West German leaders gave Dayan to understand that they supported the right of the

¹ *Der Spiegel*, September 17, 1979.

Palestinians to self-determination,¹ and that they took a negative view of Israel's policy of building Zionist settlements in occupied territories. Dayan retorted that the FRG had no business "saddling" Israel with its ideas, because the matter concerned "Israel's security".

West German papers reported that the talks between Genscher and Dayan were marked by strains and tensions. But the communique published at the end of the talks reasserted mutual interest in the planned visit to Israel of the FRG Chancellor. No date, however, was specified. At the final press conference, Dayan tried to differentiate between the views of Schmidt and Genscher, hinting that the latter was to blame for the deterioration of relations between the two countries.

As usual, the CDU stood up for Dayan: Friedrich Zimmermann, Bundestag chairman of the CDU, issued a statement criticising Genscher's stand on the Palestinian issue. But spokesmen of the FRG government denied the alleged differences in Schmidt's and Genscher's approaches to the Middle East problem. Still, Bonn wished to avoid any further deterioration in bilateral relations. This was evident from the government's action on the Economic Cooperation Ministry's proposal for cutting off financial aid to Israel.

The proposal was motivated by the fact that Israel had a fairly high per capita income and could not be considered a developing country. Besides, the Ministry pointed out, the latest payment of 65 million marks was the final installment of the 2 billion marks in compensations Adenauer had promised Israel in 1960. The move should also have been regarded as a demonstration of Bonn's disapproval of the continuing building of settlements in occupied territories. Wishing, however, to avoid a further deterioration of relations with Israel, Bonn turned the proposal down. Tel Aviv could again count on 140 million marks in annual financial aid.

¹ While making such declarations, neither Bonn nor the other West European capitals ever mentioned the right of the Arab people of Palestine to forming their own, sovereign state.

That the Israeli leaders, too, were eager to restore good relations with the FRG was evident from Dayan's meeting with Genscher on September 27 in New York. Unlike their previous meetings in Bonn, it was unusually cordial and friendly.

By November 1979, FRG-Israeli relations returned to normal. The Israeli government had realised by then that it could not make Bonn change its Middle East policy in any way substantially, even with Washington's help. Still, Tel Aviv never hesitated to express its displeasure with any of Bonn's moves when they were contrary to Israel's wishes. This was the case, for example, when the EEC countries issued their Middle East statement in 1980.

It stands to reason that the state of the political relations between the two countries both reflects and influences the state of their economic, commercial and other ties. The history of West German-Israeli economic relations began with the 1952 Treaty of Luxembourg concerning compensations. From 1968 on, the FRG was granting Israel an annual loan of 140 million marks on exceedingly easy terms: until 1977, it was a 30-year loan at 2 per cent interest per annum. Since only one-seventh of the aid was tied to specific projects, the rest could be used for anything whatsoever, including military purposes. From 1950 to 1974 FRG governmental and private aid to Israel totalled 1,841.5 million marks and rose to nearly 4,000 million by 1984.

Time and again, the Arab countries declared their displeasure over the fact that Tel Aviv was using West German aid to build up its military potential. To avoid straining relations with the Arab East, notably the oil-producing Arab countries, Bonn acted to channel its economic ties with Israel along purely commercial lines. Under a new agreement, financial aid to Israel was tied to specific projects, the annual interest was 4.5 per cent, and the duration was 20 instead of the previous 30 years.

A special West German-Israeli economic committee headed by the foreign ministers of the two countries was formed during Genscher's visit to Israel in November 1975. Its purpose was to expand commercial and financial rela-

tions. Industrialists of both countries were represented on it. By the end of 1978, West German direct investments in Israel totalled 585 million marks.

In this way, the FRG government wanted to create a favourable climate for private commercial and other economic ties with Israel. A change of the source of the funding Israel was receiving would work in the interests of the FRG and mitigate the critical Arab reaction to governmental FRG aid to Tel Aviv.

Israel's trade deficit is a permanent thing. In 1981, it exported 484 million dollars worth of goods to the FRG, while imports from that country totalled 715 million. In 1982, the deficit was still greater—Israeli imports totalled 789 million dollars and exports 432 million. In 1983, imports from the FRG rose by 21.5 per cent, while Israeli exports remained essentially the same. The list of FRG exports to Israel is headed by automobiles, electrical and other machinery, and chemicals. Israel exports mainly fruits and vegetables, and precious stones.

Arms traffic is an important element of the external strategy of imperialist states. Under FRG legislation, arms sales to other countries are subject to substantial restrictions. In fact, arms exports to "regions of tension" are forbidden. But the West German arms concerns have learned to evade the law: since 1977, the FRG has exported military goods to the tune of 2 billion marks a year, and out of this amount nearly 14 per cent (in terms of value) to countries in the so-called regions of tension, including Israel.

There is close military cooperation between the FRG and Israel. According to *Rose el-Youssef*, a Cairo weekly, Israeli military industries were employing over 150 West German experts in 1975. These experts took part in developing the latest Israeli fighter plane, the Kfir, and in upgrading the American F-15 fighter. Under a veil of rigorous secrecy, Israel has been getting West German specifications concerning manufacture of various types of weapons. This includes blueprints and other documents on a 110-mm anti-tank missile also usable to destroy anti-tank fortifications. In January 1978, the press reported that three submarines

had been built for Israel at British shipyards according to West German blueprints.

West German-Israeli ties continue to expand in other fields as well. Under an accord at governmental level, the two countries are maintaining exchanges of young people. Some 2,000 young Israelis come to the FRG each year, while Israel is visited by 6,000 young West Germans. As many as 140,000 German tourists came to Israel annually in the late 1970s. In 1979, a branch of the West German Goethe Institute was opened in Tel Aviv: it runs six-month German language courses, and has a public library. Up to half a million copies of West German newspapers and magazines are sold annually in Israel, and some 25,000 books.

It would seem that the change in the FRG government at the end of 1982 should have changed the relations between the two countries. For the CDU/CSU bloc had been attacking the SDP/FDP cabinet continuously for "pro-Arab bias". The Helmut Kohl cabinet was expected to take a pro-Israel stance. But time showed that the differences between the S.D.P. and CDU/CSU were merely tactical. West Germany's Middle East policy has remained essentially the same. This continuity was far less due to Genscher's staying in office, and more because the line worked out in the 70s by the social-liberal coalition was in West Germany's best interests.

Still, it should be noted that after the conservatives came to power, new aspects did appear in Israel-West German relations. The world public is disturbed by the revival of revenge-seeking tendencies in the FRG, and by the calls resounding from the banks of the Rhine about revising the postwar realities, reassessing past history, and the like. People in Israel are also disturbed, though the ruling elements are inclined to look at matters from a pragmatic angle. What troubles them most is that relations between the FRG and Israel are no longer "special". What they dread is that Bonn might totally forget about its "historical responsibility" to Israel.

The Israeli leadership has, with a few exceptions, been slack in working for the arraignment of Nazi war criminals.

It was passive in the cases of Klaus Barbie, inventor of murderbuses Walther Rauff, and many others. Here, too, the Israeli leaders are evidently moved by their pragmatism: why demand of reactionary Latin American regimes that they turn over war criminals if this may jeopardise Israeli arms sales to them.

Chancellor Kohl's visit to Israel in January 1984 had been a conspicuous landmark in West German-Israeli relations. It showed, among other things, that not only Bonn's policy vis-à-vis Israel had remained the same, but also that the new FRG cabinet had "inherited" the same unsolved problems. But while the Social-Democrats had gained some experience in dealing with Israeli leaders in the 1970s and managed to avoid the pitfalls, Kohl had none of this experience.

Kohl viewed Israeli-West German relations in much the same light as Helmut Schmidt. He was aware that it was important for the FRG to emphasise the "normal nature" of these relations, that is, to continue the campaign against "special relations". He overdid this, however, and aroused the displeasure of the Israelis. He stressed time and again in his public speeches that he was born in 1930, and that he was not, therefore, involved in the Nazi atrocities against Jews. This annoyed Tel Aviv, which considers the Germans' "historical responsibility" to Israel unlimited in time.

Speaking of the crimes of the Third Reich, Kohl said they were committed "in the name of the Germans", as though it had not been the Germans themselves who committed them. That, too, was received with indignation in Tel Aviv. "Kohl has lost credibility in Israel," said Asher Ben Nathan, president of the Israel-Germany Society, about the Chancellor's visit.¹

Though the Chancellor, in effect, continued the line of the Social-Democrats, he did this so clumsily that Horst Ehmke, vice-president of the S.D.P. faction in the Bundestag, described his behaviour during the visit as "bad foreign-policy dilettantism".²

West Germany's general political line in the Middle East

¹ *Der Spiegel*, February 13, 1984.

² *Europa Archiv*, March 10, 1984, p. z33.

boils down by and large at backing up the imperialist policy of the United States, and securing Western economic and strategic interests. It is directed against progressive Arab regimes, and aims at scaling down the influence of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries in the region. We have seen that, among other things, Bonn ignored the lawful rights of the Arab people of Palestine for a long time, while granting all-round aid to Israel. We saw it back the policy of separate deals, though not without some reservations.

Since 1973, FRG policy in the Middle East has been the same as that of the other EEC countries, stipulating that a Middle East settlement must be based on Security Council Resolutions 242 and 338; must rule out acquisition of territory by force; must provide for Israel's withdrawal from territories it occupied in 1967, and for respect of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of all countries in the region, and also of their right to live in peace and security within recognised frontiers.

If there is to be just and lasting peace, the lawful rights of Palestinians must, indeed, be honoured by all concerned. Ever since 1979, the EEC countries have spoken of the right of the Palestinians to have "their own national home", but did not acknowledge their right to founding a sovereign national state. They ignored the PLO as the lawful representative of the Arab people of Palestine, until their 1980 June statement finally referred vaguely to the need for "associating" the PLO with a negotiated settlement.

The so-called European initiative, as set forth in the EEC statement, yielded practically no tangible results. The United States reacted to it negatively. The White House declared that it would not tolerate West European interference in the Camp David process. The reaction of the Arab countries, though they welcomed the statement, was restrained. They described it as half-baked. And Israel's reaction was nothing short of violent. Prime Minister Begin compared it to the Munich deal of 1939, and the Israelis also fumed over the mention of the PLO. Nor did they accept the EEC's condemnation of Israel's policy of

building settlements in occupied Arab territories.

The failure of the "European initiative", coupled with US pressure on its West European allies, forced West Germany to manoeuvre and use the Reagan plan and other US moves as a screen against successive Arab and Israeli attempts to make it assume either an openly pro-Arab or a pro-Israeli posture. Though the FRG stand is the same as before, it is on the whole more distinctly pro-American. Still, despite Bonn's backing US policy on the main Middle East issues, there are fairly substantial differences between the West German and American views concerning the means and rates of settling the conflict. Because the FRG is closer to the explosive Middle East, and because its economy is much more dependent on Arab oil than America's.

In sum, the general fabric of West German-Israeli relations has not changed in recent years, despite the change of cabinets both in the FRG and Israel. As before, the main objective of the Israeli government is to try and squeeze the greatest possible political, economic and financial benefits out of the "special historical background", while the West Germans seek greater freedom of manoeuvre and continuously stress the "normal" nature of their bilateral relations with Israel.

J. Schulmeister

A CRIMINAL ALLIANCE

Zionist leaders deny that they had ever collaborated with the Nazis. They say they had always been ideological and political opponents of fascism, and saviours of Jews. If they ever do admit that they had had some dealings with the Nazis, they say it was because they wanted to save at least a few Jews.

Is it right to connive in the killing of some for the sake of saving others? One of the key principles of criminal law in any country is that to save anyone at the price of someone else's life is a crime. Those who assist killers become their accomplices. Do motivations mean anything? They may be taken into consideration, but it is actions and their results that count. So I cannot help recalling the aphorism that the road to hell is paved with good intentions.

One is tried for one's actions. For a second no less rational principle of criminal law says there can be no punishment without a punishable offence. The Zionist leaders deny their crimes—they say they had been saving Jews. Undeniably, they are concealing their misdeeds.

The general drift of Hitler's anti-Jewish policy is well known. Not so the general drift of the Zionist leaders' Jewish policy. Wolf Erlich, a prominent figure in the Communist Party of Israel, has said the following: "The Zionist leaders opposed the Nazis as exterminators of Jews, but at the same time they saw the Nazi regime as an anti-communist power, that is, a factor liable to speed up the attainment of their Zionist aims."¹

Speaking of the relationship between Zionism and Nazism

¹Wolf Erlich in the collection, *Zionism: The Truth and the Untruths*, Moscow, 1978, p. 47 (in Russian).

in those days when the survival of Europe's Jews hung in the balance, one can only say that the motivations and aims of Zionist policy changed at different stages of Hitler's man-hating anti-Semitic policy.

The first stage, as defined by SS Obergruppenführer Reinhard Heydrich, was: a) to drive out Jews from specific areas of the German nation's life, and b) to drive Jews out of the German nation's territory (*Lebensraum*).

In that first stage, emigration of Jews from Germany was encouraged. The Nazis' aim was thus something next to a gift for the Zionist leaders. They saw the Jews who were being driven out of the racist Reich as the future population of the longed-for Jewish state.

In the ten years before Hitler's rise to power, only slightly over 15,000 had come to Palestine from West European countries. The results of Zionist activity in that period were thus anything but impressive. Now, they hoped, Hitler's anti-Jewish policy would yield better results than those of Herzl and others.

In the belief that this first stage would also be the last, Zionist leaders began coordinating their "Jewish policy" with the Nazis' anti-Jewish policy. And that was where their crimes began.

A deal presupposes one aim or coinciding aims on the part of those involved in it. Well, the first aim of the two sides at this initial stage consisted in establishing Zionist control over Germany's Jewish population, since prior to Hitler's coming to power no more than three per cent of the 500,000 German Jews had been under such control. Elimination of the non-Zionist Jewish organisations, and demolition of all progressive movements would, as the Nazis conceived it, secure Jewish obedience. As the Zionists conceived it, it would secure colonists for Palestine.

The second aim of the Zionists was to gain ground in Palestine's economy on the funds of the Jewish bourgeoisie that was being driven out of Germany. The fascists had a different aim: they wanted to obtain additional capital by appropriating the bigger portion of those funds. In a way, the two aims coincided.

The third aim was to organise large-scale emigration of

German Jews to Palestine. Here the Zionists and the Nazis saw eye to eye. Prior to the outbreak of World War II, Hitler and his cronies had concealed the end goal of their anti-Semitic policy, and went through the motions of abiding by the norms of modern civilisation. This was why they wanted a "voluntary" emigration of Jews.

Describing the first stage in Hitler's anti-Semitic policy, Heydrich laid the stress on clearing out the Jews from German territory by legal means.

Dietner Wisliceny, one of the chief hangmen of Jews in Europe, reaffirmed that at that stage, until 1940, the Jewish question in Germany and German-occupied territories was to have been solved "by means of a planned emigration".¹

Those, indeed, were the aims that had initially brought together the Nazi anti-Semites and the Zionist "protectors" of Jews. The former were the organisers and the chief perpetrators, the latter were their accomplices. But both contributed to the tragedy of the European Jewry.

By the mid-1930s the Nazis had wiped out all non-Zionist Jewish organisations in Germany. Only the Zionist Federation of Germany, renamed Central Union of German Citizens of the Jewish Faith, had been spared. All Jewish newspapers and magazines had been closed down, with the sole exception of the *Jüdische Rundschau*. Fawningly obsequious, that paper described April 1, 1933 as "the day of the Jewish awakening and Jewish renaissance". In fact, it had been a day of bloody pogroms across the length and breadth of Germany.

Under the Nazi programme, Jews were disfranchised, forbidden to use any modes of transport, to enter places of entertainment, and even to use the sidewalks. They were denied access to specified parts of towns, and were totally switched out of the country's economic and business life. An unbearable time had come not only for working Jews, but even for the rich: the German bourgeoisie was using

¹ *Trial of the Major War Criminals before the International Military Tribunal*, Vol. IV, published at Nuremberg, Germany, 1947, p. 356.

the Nazis to get rid of competitors. For Jews there was only one way out: to leave Germany while the going was good and take out at least a part of their fortune.

In June 1933, the Anglo-Palestine Bank controlled by the Jewish Agency, and the Nazi Ministry for National Economy concluded a secret agreement which the Zionists code-named *Ha' avara*, "deal" in Hebrew, whereby Jews leaving for Palestine deposited their money in a special account at two German banks. The share of the deposited money due to either side was specified. As a result, the Nazis appropriated nearly 50 million dollars or over half the deposited amount in a matter of five years, from 1933 to 1938. What was left to the Jewish bourgeoisie, something like 40 million dollars, was invested in the economy of what was to become a Zionist Jewish state. In those days that was a gigantic sum, amounting to 60 per cent of total investments in Palestine.

Large-scale coordinated measures were taken in Palestine to resettle Jews driven out of Germany. A high-ranking Jewish Agency official, Chaim Arlosoroff, came to Berlin in 1933 to open a Palestine Office, the mission of Zionist trusts colonising Palestine, the Keren Hayesod, and others. One of the future founders and prime ministers of the State of Israel, Levi Eshkol, was employed in the agricultural department of that office for all of three years. A secret agreement with Himmler's agency governed the selection of Palestinian colonists, their ideological processing and military training in specially set up reeducation camps.

The collaboration proceeded apace, and Baron Leopold von Mildenstein, chief of the Jewish section of the SD, visited Palestine in 1934 on the invitation of Zionist organisations. In September and October 1934, a series of Mildenstein's articles appeared in the leading Nazi propaganda medium, *Der Angriff*, extolling the Zionist colonisation of Palestine.

In early 1937, Feivel Polkes, an agent of the Haganah, the Zionist armed force in Palestine, came to Berlin to negotiate with Adolf Eichmann, who had replaced Baron von Mildenstein. The top Nazi hangman of Jews and the Zionist agent agreed on the following: the Gestapo would

exercise "pressure" on Jews who were being driven out of Germany to go to Palestine, in return for which the Zionists, as the transcript of the negotiations found in Himmler's archives says, would supply Germany with information and back its policy in the Middle East.

That this criminal collaboration was carried into effect is borne out by a detailed account found in the archives of the Gestapo of a trip to Palestine of Eichmann and Hagen, chief of the II-112 department of the SD, to upgrade contacts with the Haganah. They arrived in Haifa in the guise of journalists on October 2, 1937. Thereupon, they went to Cairo, where Eichmann negotiated with Polkes on October 10 and 11. In their report, Eichmann and Hagen recorded the following statement by Polkes: "In Jewish nationalist circles people were very pleased with the radical German policy." The Nazis also put down in their report that in pursuance of their earlier understanding, Polkes handed them the promised intelligence. It included information about the anti-Nazi activity of Jewish organisations in various countries.

A month passed. The thugs in Himmler's agency organised what has come to be known as the Night of Broken Glass. Pogroms of unprecedented magnitude occurred in all parts of Germany. Countless numbers of people were killed or crippled, and nearly 20,000 Jews were arrested by the Gestapo. The Nazis set on fire 191 synagogues, completely destroyed another 76 and looted something like 815 shops and 29 department stores belonging to Jews. These figures are from Heydrich's report addressed to Hermann Goering, but they do not give the complete picture by far. "The extent of the destruction of Jewish shops and houses," Heydrich himself observed in the report, "cannot yet be verified by figures."¹

How did the Zionists react to these bloody events? Did they at least realise that their connivance had encouraged the killers? Nothing of the sort. They continued to aid the Nazis, and to exploit the blood and torment of Jews in building up a population for their projected state.

¹ *International Military Tribunal. . . , op. cit.*, pp. 248-279.

On January 5, 1939, *Hvilia*, a Zionist paper published in Lvov, reported with a reference to the *Essener Nationalzeitung*, that Hjalmar Schacht, president of the Reichsbank, had negotiated with the Rt. Hon. Montague Collet Norman, Governor of the Bank of England, who represented the Zionists. "Schacht's plan," the paper said, "envisages dividing the Jews into those who work and those who do not, and to classify Jewish elements according to their ability to assimilate in places of emigration."

Soon, details of the plan were published. On January 17, 1939, referring to a Berlin report, *Hvilia* said "the plan was built upon the fact that there were 600,000 Jews in the Reich, divided into three categories: 1) about 150,000 economically active, who will emigrate in specified yearly, and accordingly monthly, contingents, 2) the economically passive, dependents of Jews of the first category (wives and children), who will emigrate when their breadwinners become able to maintain them in the new place, and 3) old men and women, and those incapable of emigrating, who will stay in Germany."

Old men and women, wives and children, and other helpless people were to stay in Germany! Did the Zionist leaders know the fate of those whom they were abandoning, those for whom it is usual to care first of all? It was not difficult to deduce the fate that lay in store for them from Hitler's Reichstag speech of January 30, 1939: he said he would wipe out the Jewish race in Europe. At that time, too, Reichsminister Alfred Rosenberg wrote in an article in *Weltkampf* that the Jewish question would be resolved when no Jews survived on the European continent.

The deadly threat to Jews in Germany and elsewhere in Europe did not alter the attitude of the Zionist leadership, which regarded European Jews above all as the building material for a Jewish state. This was the reason US President Franklin Roosevelt was forced to give up his scheme of offering asylum to 500,000 European Jews. Here is how he explained his setback to Morris Ernst, a civil rights lawyer and public leader: "We can't put it over because the dominant Jewish leadership of America won't

stand for it. . . . The Zionist movement knows that Palestine is and will be for some time a remittance society. They know that they can raise vast sums for Palestine by saying to donors, 'There is no other place this poor Jew can go'."¹

Thirty-seven years later, at a symposium held under the auspices of *Ma'ariv*, an Israeli newspaper, Eliezer Livne, editor of the organ of the Haganah at the time of World War II, would say that for the Zionist leadership then the rescue of Jews was not an aim in itself, but only a means.

Not an aim! Only a means! The 16th Congress of the Communist Party of Israel had more than enough grounds to say that "during the Second World War, too, the Zionist leadership sought for a way to the nazi leaders in order to realise Zionist aims even at the expense of masses of the Jewish people".²

But how did the Zionist aims relate to the toll in lives paid by the mass of the Jewish people?

According to the *Encyclopedia of Zionism and Israel*, 35,858 German Jews arrived in Palestine between 1932 and 1938, and another 14,247 between 1939 and 1945. This means that as a result of the Zionist-Nazi deal, only one out of every ten German Jews who were allowed to leave Germany emigrated to Palestine. Altogether, 215,222 Jews came to Palestine from all over Europe in 1933 to 1939. Compare that figure with the six million Jews who were killed in Nazi concentration camps and ghettos.

We are farthest from the thought that the Zionists could have saved all these six million. But we do accuse them of connivance, of furthering their own ends by abandoning to their fate those who could have saved themselves by resisting the enemy or finding asylum in other countries.

During the years of the holocaust, Livne said at the already cited *Ma'ariv* symposium, the main national task

¹ Alfred M. Lilienthal, *The Other Side of the Coin*, Devin-Adair, New York, 1965, p. 22.

² *Information Bulletin of the Communist Party of Israel*, Special Issue, 3-4/69, p. 197.

should have been to save the Jews in the Diaspora. He amplified: "I wish to say what we ought to have done, if we had considered as the main objective the rescue of the maximum of Jews in their places. The centres of action were the partisan (guerilla) bases. Partisans were in Poland, Lithuania, in the areas of Russia occupied by the nazis, in Yugoslavia, and a bit later in Slovakia, too. If we had considered the main thing the disruption of the extermination, and if we had made contact with those centres—we could have saved many."

Could have, but did not. The Zionist leaders' contacts with the Nazis did not cease even after the latter had begun exterminating Jews en masse in Nazi-occupied countries. The anti-communism of the leaders of the World Zionist Organisation and the Jewish Agency ruled out joint action with Communists who organised the Resistance. As a result, the aim was to save only those who could be used in carrying out the Palestinian plan.

In early 1943, when most Jews in the Nazi-occupied European countries had already been exterminated, when the cremation furnaces in Oswiecim (Auschwitz), Treblinka and Maidanek were working overtime, when Jews were being killed off in hundreds of ghettos all over Europe, the head of the Jewish Agency's so-called Rescue Committee, Yitzhak Gruenbaum, wrote: "Zionism is above all. . . . And when some asked me: 'Can't you give money from the Keren Hayesod (the National Fund—*Ed.*) to save Jews in the Diaspora? 'I said: no! And again I say no!"

Was this Gruenbaum's personal decision? A study by A. Morgenstern, published on September 19, 1971 as a supplement to the Israeli paper *Ediot ahronot*, shows that in 1943 Zionist leaders had debated the issue of saving Jews who would not in future go to Palestine. And Gruenbaum's view won.

In early 1944, this "chief rescuer" of Jews again said: "I say simply and clearly: our main concern is Palestine." A short time later, the leaders of the Jewish Agency received a secret memorandum saying that since the Rescue Committee failed to yield big results in terms of numbers, it would be desirable to at least reap some political benefits

from it for the future of Zionism: the activity of the Rescue Committee should show the world that the only country wishing to receive rescued Jews was Palestine.

So Palestine was the only country wishing to receive Jews? As I have already said, only about 50,000 German Jews had gone to Palestine in the years of Nazi rule. Compare that with another figure: The Soviet Union saved 200,000 Polish Jews, or two-thirds of those who survived the war after Poland was overrun.

Not only did the Soviet Union save Jews. It told the world the truth about the Nazi genocide of Jews and people of other nationalities, and called for unrelenting struggle against fascism. The People's Foreign Affairs Commissariat of the USSR issued a note on January 6, 1942, concerning "wholesale plunder and pillage, and the monstrous atrocities committed by the German authorities in occupied Soviet territories". The note described the Nazi abominations and, in particular, the scale and nature of the slaughter of Jews, the nightmarish mass killing of "unarmed and defenceless Jews". On April 27, 1942, another note of the USSR Foreign Commissariat revealed on the strength of countless facts that "the Nazi atrocities committed against the peaceful Soviet population eclipse all the other bloody chapters in the history of mankind".

It was neither the United States nor Britain, but the Soviet Union that in a Sovinformbureau report of December 19, 1942, exposed the end goals of the Nazi anti-Jewish policy. The official document bore the following head: "Hitlerite Authorities Plan to Exterminate Europe's Jewish Population". It said, among other things: "The Hitlerites and their accomplices are going ahead with their special plan of *exterminating the Jewish population in the occupied part of Europe to the last man*. . . . This cannibal plan drawn up by Hitler earlier this year provides for the concentration before the end of 1942 in Eastern Europe, chiefly in Polish territory, of some four million Jews, in order to put them to death." The Soviet government warned the organisers and perpetrators of these evil deeds: "The hand of the peoples who will throw out the German-fascist conquerors will mete out severe punishment.

Neither the ruling Hitlerite clique nor the contemptible executors of its bloody criminal orders will escape retribution."

How did Zionist leaders react to the Soviet statements? The January note of the Foreign Commissariat of the USSR was declared "Bolshevik propaganda" by the World Zionist Organisation, while statements of the Jewish Agency on July 7 and September 28, 1942, described Soviet reports exposing the Hitlerite atrocities as "unbelievable inventions".

Why did the leaders of international Zionism oppose dissemination of the truth? Dov Joseph, in 1942 acting director of the Jewish Agency's Political Department, explained this as follows: "If we announce the millions of Jews who have been slaughtered by the Nazis, we will justifiably be asked where the millions of Jews are, for whom we claim that we shall need to provide a home in Eretz Israel after the war ends."

If that were the only reason, the guilt of the Zionist chiefs before the Jews and all other people would still be very great. By taking part in concealing the truth they had objectively worked in favour of the Nazis, impeding the mobilisation of the spiritual and material resources of the anti-Hitler coalition. But Dov Joseph did not tell us the whole truth. On February 18, 1943, at a meeting of the World Zionist Organisation's executive, one more reason was revealed: "Zionism is above all—it is necessary to sound this whenever a Holocaust diverts us from our war of liberation in Zionism."

Yet even this cynical revelation did not reflect the depth to which the Zionist leaders had fallen. Hushing up the Nazi crimes was a logical continuation of the initial criminal deal. Having once told the truth of the Nazi genocide, they would have had to publicly admit their flirtation with the Nazis, and make public the failure of the plans to resettle European Jews in Palestine with Nazi assistance. For hadn't it been for the sake of these plans that Zionists justified the persecution of Jews in Germany, and hadn't they maintained that this was right and far-sighted.

In September 1933, the *Czernowitzer Allgemeine Zei-*

tung, mouthpiece of the Bukovina Zionists, carried an article by Dr. Manfred Reifer, "The Lot of the German Jews". Chief of the Bukovina Zionists and member of the Jewish Agency, he had the unmitigated gall to describe Hitler's anti-Semitic policies as a "natural process" for which the Jews themselves were mostly to blame because they had lost the "Jewish spirit". He angrily attacked Karl Marx, founder of scientific communism, Ferdinand Lassalle and Rosa Luxemburg, those outstanding leaders of the international working-class movement, cursed the great Heinrich Heine for his "unJewish poetry", and also composer Mendelssohn and artist Max Liebermann. He showered curses on the heads of Soviet Jews for taking part in building socialism, and warned them they would be in still more terrible straits than the German Jews. The Zionist called on people to "learn to understand the course of history even if that course may be sprinkled with blood". Showing us what had led up to Zionism's collaboration with the Nazis, Reifer wrote: 1) Jews must learn to be patient and "accustom" themselves to the thought that not all can save themselves, and 2) only the select few, those who put their trust in Zionism, would survive. Zionists were helping their own; talks with the authorities had already begun about their going to Palestine.

Goebbels called Reifer an "objective Jew". He quoted Reifer's filthy article again and again, and had it reprinted in Nazi papers and journals. During the war, Reifer became a trusted flunkey of Otto Olendorf, chief of the Chernovtsy Gestapo. Reifer's letter of August 9, 1942, to Bukovina Governor Calotescu, was found among papers abandoned by the Nazis when retreating. Submitting one more of his articles whitewashing the Nazi killers, Reifer suggested that it should be published "in some neutral country, such as Switzerland, in German, English, French, Italian, and Spanish". To complete the picture, we may recall that more than 50,000 of the 60,000 Chernovtsy Jews were exterminated during the Nazi occupation of that city.

Many other Zionist leaders in Nazi-occupied territories behaved just as criminally—to save their own skins and

those of their followers they did not hesitate to abandon hundreds of thousands of Jews to their sad fate.

A prewar leader of the Betar, an international Zionist youth organisation, and now a leading ideologue and practitioner of Zionist racism, Menachem Begin, managed to escape from Nazi-occupied Poland. His close aide, Josef Glazman, on the other hand, saved his skin by accepting the post of inspector of the Jewish police in the Vilna ghetto. The chief of that police was another Zionist, Jacob Gens.

This writer took part in investigating Nazi crimes in the Lvov area, and has been collecting evidence of fascist genocide for over thirty years. What does this evidence show? It shows that prominent leaders of the international Zionist movement and its branch in Galicia had been chiefs of the Lvov Judenrat. Its first chairman, Iosif Parnas, had for many years been a member of the executive of the Zionist organisation in Galicia. He was replaced by another prominent Zionist, Adolf Rothfeld. The third Judenrat chairman, Heinrich Landesberg, had also for many years been a member of the Zionist executive in Galicia.

The Nazis formed the Judenrat to assist in assembling 130,000 Jews in the Lvov ghetto. How? On November 6, 1941, Galicia Nazi Governor Lasch instructed Stadthauptman Kuyat to set up a Lvov ghetto, and suggested that he act through the council of Jewish elders, the Judenrat. Did the members of the Judenrat realise what they were needed for? Certainly. David Kahane, former rabbi of Lvov, put down in his diary that in March 1942 Heinrich Landesberg, chairman of the Judenrat, had said to him and another two rabbis: "You probably think that these are prewar times and you have come to the chairman of the Jewish religious community. We are living in entirely different times and our community is not religious; it is merely an executive organ of the Gestapo."

How did this executive organ of the Gestapo operate at the time the Lvov ghetto was being set up?

On November 8, 1941, a notice signed by Governor Lasch was posted on all walls, saying the city's Jewish

population must move to a ghetto by December 10, 1941. Jews living in the rich quarter were exempted. It was all too easy to understand what was in store for Jews in the ghetto. Clause 11 of the notice said: "Jews who leave the area designated for their stay without permission, shall be put to death . . . as will all persons who deliberately accord asylum to Jews."

Members of the Judenrat were allowed to live outside the ghetto. This they took as a sign that their lives would be spared. On November 10, 1941, Adolf Rothfeld, who was then acting chairman of the Judenrat, told Governor Lasch that the ghetto instructions had been "received and the Judenrat would do its best to carry them out".

A fortnight passed. On November 25, 1941, Rothfeld, already endorsed as Judenrat chairman, informed Governor Lasch that most of the Jewish population of Lvov had been moved to the ghetto, and asked him to defer until the spring of 1942 the removal there of the wealthy Jews living in the 2nd city district. Lasch issued such a deferral for a bribe that ran into seven figures. All other Lvov Jews were transferred to the ghetto within the specified time. They believed the Judenrat when it said that the walls of the ghetto would protect them against further persecution, and also believed its promise that it would care for them and protect them.

The Nazis and the nationalist scum of the "Ukrainian" police killed many Jews as they were moving into the ghetto. But even this indication of what lay in store was used by the Judenrat to back up its story of "safety" within the walls of the ghetto. That was a way of undermining the will to resist, of paralysing attempts to flee and find refuge.

Nowadays, Zionist leaders and ideologues deny they had had anything to do with setting up ghettos. But in those days they described their involvement in the racist slaughter as a "service to the Jewish cause". On January 14, 1942, the Zionist *Jewish Gazette* wrote the following about the Lvov ghetto: "The setting up of the Jewish community which is to take care of the lives of some 120,000 Jews, has been completed. And that this was done in so short a time

is to the credit of the Lvov council of elders headed by chairman Dr. Adolf Rothfeld and vice-chairman Dr. Heinrich Landesberg. Their past experience in social work over some decades has enabled them to carry this colossal undertaking into effect without a hitch."

The newspaper of the Lvov Judenrat was thereby teaching its readers to comply with the humiliating racist classification that divided people like cattle, by breeds, it informed them who was to be considered a Jew, and announced that all Jews, from the age of ten, were obliged to wear special emblems on their clothes. Readers were also told that moving into the ghetto, a family could take along belongings not exceeding 25 kilos in weight.

What did the Lvov Judenrat and its police do after the ghetto had been established? To save themselves, their followers, and some wealthy Jews, they took an active part in the extermination of ghetto inmates, and in shipping them off to death camps.

A former Lvov ghetto inmate, Dr. Philip Friedman, wrote in a book of remembrances published in Lodz in 1945, *The Extermination of Lvov Jews*, that there had been several classes of people in the ghetto—from the highly privileged (members of the Judenrat, officials of the supply and housing departments) down to the least privileged (manual labourers and partly employed), while the main purpose of the round-ups was to apprehend and ship out the mass of those who were out of work.

Among the privileged, the Jewish police (Jüdische Ordnungsdienst) held a special place. Lvov rabbi David Kahane, aghast over its abominations, wrote in his diary: "The militia was an organ of the community, but it received all its directives and orders from the Gestapo. It carried out all Gestapo orders. . . . To save their own skin, its members betrayed other people and led their own brothers to slaughter."

The next group in this hierarchy of traitors were the officials of the Judenrat's supply department, whose job was to minister to the wants of their German masters. They rushed from house to house, confiscating Jewish property to meet German "requests" in time.

It did not take long for the ghetto inmates to realise the true purpose of the Judenrat and its departments. Paralysed by the Nazi terrorism, the endless persecutions, and the specious promises of the Judenrat Zionists that soon "things will improve", many resigned themselves to their fate, while the brave, like proletarian poet Jakov Schudrich and other progressives, organised themselves to resist the Nazis and their Zionist accomplices.

To suppress resistance, the Judenrat formed a special "criminal department". On February 4, 1942, the *Jewish Gazette* reported that some sixty of the most capable officers of the Jewish police had been picked to man this department.

Despite the efforts of these "most capable officers", resistance in the ghetto increased. A police prison was needed. And on April 29, 1942, the *Jewish Gazette* reported: "A team of the Jewish law-enforcement service has requisitioned house 45 in Jerel Street, where temporarily arrested people will be detained as of May 1."

The Jewish police prison had one more purpose: it was a transit centre for ghetto inmates picked out by the Judenrat to meet the Gestapo schedule of shipments to death camps. To the police, the prison was a source of additional incomes.

A twelve-year-old prison inmate, Janina Gesheles, wrote this item in her diary: "In the little cell there already were sixty people—they sat on the floor almost atop of each other—men, women, and children. . . . Each had to pay for what he ate. . . . There was a big close-stool in one corner, and men and women used it. Those who had connections or were able to pay 100 zlotys, could go out into the yard."

Systematically, the SD and Gestapo carried out what they called "actions", which spelled death for thousands of Jews. And in all these "actions", the Judenrat and its police took an active part.

The first such "action" took place in March 1942. Before it came, the alertness of ghetto inmates was deliberately lulled. The *Jewish Gazette* reported that "a police parade will be held in few days". In the same issue, the paper reported there would be a concert in the Judenrat hall,

featuring Willie Katz, sergeant-major of the Jewish police known to have been a popular radio performer.

Willie Katz went into his act, and the "action" began: the Judenrat and the Jewish police turned 15,000 Jews over to the Nazis to be done to death. Rabbi David Kahane admits in his diary that in compliance with Gestapo orders, the "action" was carried out by the Judenrat. The few surviving ghetto inmates recall in their diaries the treacherous part played by the Zionist Judenrat in the extermination of Lvov's Jewish population. Here is a description of the March (1942) "action" by a ghetto inmate, E. Levine. She wrote: "The Hitlerites wanted five or six thousand lives. They got them. The lives of the poorest among us, those who had no money to buy a paper certifying that they had a job, or to bribe the police. The 'action' was to begin at night... Night came, we were in bed, but none of us slept. At about midnight shouts rang out demanding that we open the front door. It was the Jewish police. They searched the house from top to bottom."

The Judenrat accomplices of the Nazis stand accused in the diary of a woman named Rubinstein, a ghetto inmate who was done to death. Here is what she wrote: "From the beginning of March a systematic 'action' was launched against the unemployed. The 'action' went on at short intervals throughout the month of March. It was conducted by the council of elders. It was to deliver 20,000 Jews into the hands of the Germans."

Philip Friedman tells us in his remembrances: "In March 1942, the holocaust reached Lvov. Here, too, the Germans employed 'military' tactics which amounted to having Jews (the Jewish police) destroy Jews... The Germans suggested that the Judenrat should itself pick out people subject to resettlement. Teams of Judenrat personnel were formed who together with the Jewish police, under the direction of Germans, broke into Jewish homes, checked job certificates, ascertained the age and state of health of the inmates, and, depending on the result of their check, picked out people whom they took to the assembly centre... The victims of the resettlement totalled some 15,000."

Hard as it tried, the Judenrat and its police failed to deliver the requisite number of victims. Whereupon the German *Schutzpolizei* and the "Ukrainian" police formed of out-and-out bourgeois nationalists went into action and delivered the desired number.

Those selected were sent to their death. Yet on May 20, 1942, the *Jewish Gazette* had the impudence to call on the Jewish population to respect the authority of the Jewish law-enforcement service, the police, and to show unquestioning discipline and obedience. "Discipline and obedience," it added, "rule out all criticism of received orders."

While engaged in the mass extermination of Jews, the Nazis did not object to the dissemination of Zionist propaganda. Judenrat papers glorified Zionist leaders, extolled Theodor Herzl, and depicted the Nazi genocide as "concern" for the "reeducation" of Jews. The Zionist accomplices of the Nazis deceived the ghetto inmates in every possible way, and thereby secured their obedience.

On April 1, 1942, an editorial in the *Jewish Gazette* urged obedience and "ceaseless effort in improving oneself", and promised that all misadventures would end "fairly". There was no end to its cynicism. By re-education through labour in Nazi concentration camps, it said, the Jewish nation would be "reborn". It as much as said that Jews did not like hard work, but would be taught to like it by the Nazis, and should be grateful.

What did these obsequious services to the Nazis lead to? To the extermination of Galicia Jews. Nor did the Nazis spare their Zionist accomplices, for their policy was not just class-oriented but also racist.

Fritz Katzmann, chief of the SS and of the Galicia police, reported to his superiors on June 30, 1943: "All Jewish residential areas have been cleared. Thus, the district of Galicia has been cleared of Jews, not counting those, of course, who are in camps under the control of the chief of the SS and the police. The police and gendarmerie are hunting down individual Jews and subjecting them to special treatment. As of June 27, 1943, we have resettled 454,329 Jews."

How does Katzmann's report relate to the present? The

remains of the victims have rotted in their mass graves, while their SS killers and their nationalist accomplices reside unpunished in the FRG and other countries that claim to "respect human rights". According to Charles Allen, an editor of *The Nation*, at least 3,000 Nazi criminals are harboured in the United States. Yet they are guilty of having killed tens and hundreds of thousands of Soviet citizens and citizens of Poland, Hungary, and other countries.

Six million Poles, including more than three million of Jewish descent, were exterminated during the Nazi occupation of Poland. Yet the United States have extradited only one of their killers. Millions of people had been exterminated by the Nazi occupation forces and their accomplices in temporarily over-run Soviet territory. Yet the US authorities do not extradite the criminals who have found asylum in the USA. In the Lvov area alone, as many as 700,000 Soviet citizens were killed in the three years of Nazi occupation, but over 200 of those who killed them are still being harboured by the US authorities. Here is a typical example. One Yuri Teodorovich had served in the "Ukrainian" police during the Nazi occupation of Lvov, and took part in killings and in shipping Lvov ghetto inmates to their death. In a report to his superiors, he wrote: "On the 14th of August 1942, during an action, I, Yuri Teodorovich, fired six bullets to kill two people in the Jewish prayer-house, where they were hiding and did not want to come out. German policeman Leo Pefel was with me. The dead were left in the prayer-house. They must be taken away and buried."

This report, along with much other evidence was turned over to the US Department of Justice. Yet Teodorovich lived on comfortably in Troy, N.Y., for years. When he was finally summoned to court in January 1984, he was given a chance to escape. What now? A spokesman of the Department of Justice announced that if Teodorovich is ever found outside the USA, he will be forbidden to return. That is all.

What do Zionist leaders think of these killers going free? They do not care. I would say more: for the sake of

common anti-communist aims, Israel is prepared to fraternise with the worst of these criminals. Julian Zablotsky, an active member of Ukrainian bourgeois nationalist gangs who had killed Jews, was received in Israel with honours. A. Kogen, a former inmate of Nazi concentration camps, wrote about the behaviour of the Zionist rulers in the Israeli paper, *Lezte naes*: "Their hatred of the Soviet regime is driving them crazy, and they are prepared to serve even the devil as long as, in their view, it will harm the Soviet Union."

Kogen is wrong on just one point: the Zionist chiefs are not crazy. They are acting in cold blood as they repeat the crimes of the Nazis. In occupied Arab lands Israeli aggressors have been killing off men and women, children and old people—not Jews but Arabs, who, by the way, are also Semites. Thousands of Arab inmates are languishing and dying in concentration camps—not Nazi but Zionist, and also racist. The Nazi racists exterminated millions of people of different nationality, but there followed the crushing defeat of Nazi Germany. The Zionist rulers of the State of Israel would do well to remember the lessons of history. There is still a chance to settle the Middle East problem peacefully. Yet the organisers of the genocide will not escape the inevitable retribution that all humanity will mete out to them.

REQUEST TO READERS

Progress Publishers would be glad to have your opinion of this book, its translation and design and any suggestions you may have for future publications.

Please send all your comments to 17, Zubovsky Boulevard, Moscow, USSR.

Progress Publishers

put out recently

GALIULLIN, R., *The CIA in Asia. Covert Operations Against India and Afghanistan*

R. Galiullin, a journalist and specialist in international affairs, has written a book based on facts, many of which are not known to the general reader. The book is an eloquent testimony to the effect that the American Central Intelligence Agency is hostile to everything progressive and deprived of any moral and ethical principles.

The circumstances under which the American spying agency emerged and its activities indicate that the founders of the CIA were by no means merely concerned with the security of the United States, as American propaganda would have one believe. This ugly child of the cold war and the policy of balancing on the verge of nuclear disaster was initially conceived by the powerful wealthy in the United States as one of the basic tools to be used in the reshaping of the postwar world according to American standards as well as for state terrorism against national liberation movement.

There have been many books and articles on the CIA. Galiullin's book is a vivid description of the agency's activities in countries of Asia, primarily in India and in Afghanistan.

Recommended for the general reader.

Progress Publishers

put out recently

IGNATIEV, O., *The Apollo Heads for Alien Waters*

This documentary narrative relates the activities of the CIA in Portugal during the first two years after the 25 April 1974 revolution that overthrew the fascist regime.

Based on extensive factual material, it shows how the ruling circles of the United States interfere in the internal affairs of a sovereign state, organising conspiracies, preparing terrorist acts, supporting and financing political intrigues directed against the people, and creating and directing the actions of ultra-reactionary organisations and parties.

A political thriller, the book paints a broad picture of the CIA's criminal actions against Portugal.

Recommended for a broad range of readers.

**ZIONISM - Enemy
of Peace and Social
Progress**

ISBN 5-01-000486-0